arXiv:1406.0657v2 [math.AG] 12 Jun 2014

Key polynomials for simple extensions of valued fields

F. J. Herrera Govantes*
Departamento de Álgebra
Facultad de Matemáticas
Avda. Reina Mercedes, s/n
Universidad de Sevilla
41012 Sevilla, Spain
email: jherrera@algebra.us.es

W. Mahboub
Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse
UMR 5219 du CNRS,
Université Paul Sabatier
118, route de Narbonne
31062 Toulouse cedex 9, France.
email: wael.mahboub@math.univ-toulouse.fr

M. A. Olalla Acosta*†
Departamento de Álgebra
Facultad de Matemáticas
Avda. Reina Mercedes, s/n
Universidad de Sevilla
41012 Sevilla, Spain
email: miguelolalla@algebra.us.es

M. Spivakovsky†
Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse
UMR 5219 du CNRS,
Université Paul Sabatier
118, route de Narbonne
31062 Toulouse cedex 9, France.
email: mark.spivakovsky@math.univ-toulouse.fr

June 13, 2014

Abstract

In this paper we present a refined version of MacLane's theory of key polynomials [6, 7], similar to those considered by M. Vaquié [9], and reminiscent of related objects studied by Abhyankar and Moh (approximate roots [1], [2]) and T.C. Kuo [4], [5].

Let K be a valued field with rank 1 valuation ν. Given a simple transcendental extension of valued fields $\iota : K \hookrightarrow L \cong K(x)$ we associate to ι a countable well ordered set of polynomials of $K[x]$ called key polynomials. We define limit key polynomials and give an explicit description of them. We also give an upper bound on the order type of the set of key polynomials.

1 Introduction

Let $\iota : K \hookrightarrow L \cong K(x)$ be a simple transcendental extension of valued fields, where K is equipped with a valuation ν of rank 1. That is, we assume given a rank 1 valuation ν of K and its extension ν' to L. Let (R_ν, M_ν, k_ν) denote the valuation ring of ν. The purpose of this paper is to present a refined version of MacLane's theory of key polynomials [6, 7], similar to those considered by M. Vaquié [9], and reminiscent of related objects studied by Abhyankar and Moh (approximate roots [1], [2]) and T.C. Kuo [4], [5].

Namely, we associate to ι a countable well ordered set

$$\mathbf{Q} = \{Q_i\}_{i\in\Lambda} \subset K[x];$$

*Partally suported by MTM2010-19298 and FEDER
†Partially supported by P12-FQM-2696

the Q_i are called **key polynomials**. Key polynomials Q_i which have no immediate predecessor are called **limit key polynomials**. Let $\beta_i = \nu'(Q_i)$.

We give an explicit description of the limit key polynomials (which may be viewed as a generalization of the Artin–Schreier polynomials). We also give an upper bound on the order type of the set of key polynomials. Namely, we show that if char $k_\nu = 0$ then the set of key polynomials has order type at most ω, while in the case char $k_\nu = p > 0$ this order type is bounded above by $\omega \times \omega$, where ω stands for the first infinite ordinal.

Let Γ (resp. Γ') denote the value group of ν (resp. ν'). Let Γ'_1 denote the smallest non-zero isolated subgroup of Γ' (it may happen that $\Gamma'_1 = \Gamma'$).

The main application of this theory that we have in mind is proving the local uniformization theorem for quasi-excellent noetherian schemes in positive and mixed characteristic. In Chapter 3 of his Ph.D. thesis (Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse, 2013) J.-C. San Satrunino reduced the local uniformization theorem in the case of positive characteristic to the problem of the monomialization of the first limit key polynomial of a certain explicitly defined simple field extension $K \hookrightarrow L$. In Chapter 4 he proved a similar reduction for local uniformization in the case of mixed characteristic, but under some additional hypotheses. For the purposes of local uniformization, we will be mainly interested in key polynomials whose values lie in Γ'_1. As soon as our algorithm produces a key polynomial whose value does not lie in Γ'_1, we stop. Chapter 3 of the Ph.D. thesis of W. Mahboub (Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse, 2013) develops the theory of key polynomials for valuations of arbitrary rank; here we limit ourselves to the minimum necessary for local uniformization.

The well ordered set $\mathbf{Q} = \{Q_i\}_{i\in\Lambda}$ of key polynomials of ν' will be defined recursively in i.

Notation. We will use the notation $\mathbb{N}$ for the set of strictly positive integers and $\mathbb{N}_0$ for the set of non-negative integers.

For an element $\ell \in \Lambda$, we will denote by $\ell + 1$ the immediate successor of ℓ in Λ. The immediate predecessor of ℓ, when it exists, will be denoted by $\ell - 1$. For a positive integer t, $\ell + t$ will denote the immediate successor of $\ell + (t-1)$. For an element $\ell \in \Lambda$, the initial segment $\{Q_i\}_{i<\ell}$ of the set of key polynomials will be denoted by $\mathbf{Q}_\ell$. For the rest of this paper, we let $p = \text{char } k_\nu$ if char $k_\nu > 0$ and $p = 1$ if *char* $k_\nu = 0$. For an element $\beta \in \Gamma'$, let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}'_\beta &= \{y \in L \mid \nu'(y) \geq \beta\} \cup \{0\} \\ \mathbf{P}'_{\beta+} &= \{y \in L \mid \nu'(y) > \beta\} \cup \{0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Put $G_{\nu'} = \bigoplus_{\beta\in\Gamma'} \frac{\mathbf{P}'_\beta}{\mathbf{P}'_{\beta+}}$ and $G_{\nu'1} = \bigoplus_{\beta\in\Gamma'_1} \frac{\mathbf{P}'_\beta}{\mathbf{P}'_{\beta+}}$.

For an element $\beta' \in \Gamma'$, let $P'_{\beta'}$ denote the R_ν-submodule of $K[x]$ consisting of all the polynomials of value greater than or equal to β'. A set of key polynomials is said to be **complete** if for every $\beta' \in \Gamma'$ the additive group $P'_{\beta'}$ is generated by the products of the form $c \prod_{j=1}^{s} Q_{i_j}^{\gamma_j}$, where $c \in K$, $i_j \in \Lambda$ and $\gamma_j \in \mathbb{N}$, contained in $P'_{\beta'}$ (in particular, the valuation ν' is completely determined by the data $\{Q_i, \nu'(Q_i)\}$; see Definition 3.1 below). It is said to be 1-**complete** if the above condition holds only for $\beta' \in \Gamma'_1$, in other words, if for all $\beta \in \Gamma'_1$ any polynomial $f \in K[x]$ with $\nu'(f) = \beta$ belongs to the additive group generated by products of the form $a \prod_{j=1}^{s} Q_{i_j}^{\gamma_j}$, $a \in K$, such that $\sum_{j=1}^{s} \gamma_j \nu'(Q_{i_j}) + \nu(a) \geq \beta$.

We will use the following multi-index notation: $\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1} = \{\gamma_i\}_{i\leq\ell}$, where the γ_i are non-

negative integers, all but finitely many of which are equal to 0, and

$$\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}} = \prod_{i\leq\ell} Q_i^{\gamma_i}. \tag{1.1}$$

An ℓ-**standard monomial** in $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+1}$ is a product of the form

$$c_{\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}} \mathbf{Q}_{\ell+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}}, \tag{1.2}$$

where $c_{\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}} \in K$ and the multiindex $\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}$ satisfies certain additional conditions to ensure a form of uniqueness (see Definition 3.9). An ℓ-**standard expansion** is a finite sum of ℓ-standard monomials. In §3 we will show that for any $\ell \in \Lambda$ and any $f \in K[x]$ the element f admits an ℓ-standard expansion

$$f = \sum_{j=0}^{s_\ell} c_{j\ell} Q_\ell^j, \tag{1.3}$$

where each $c_{j\ell}$ is an ℓ-standard expansion not involving Q_ℓ. We define an auxiliary valuation ν_ℓ of ℓ by putting $\nu_\ell(f) = \min_{0\leq j\leq s_\ell} \{\nu'(c_{j\ell}) + j\beta_\ell\}$ for each $f \in K[x]$. By the axioms for valuations, we have

$$\nu'(f) \geq \nu_\ell(f) \tag{1.4}$$

for all $f \in K[x]$. Then the statement that $\mathbf{Q}$ is a complete set of key polynomials can be expressed as follows: for any $f \in K[x]$ there exists $\ell \in \Lambda$ such that equality holds in (1.4).

In §3 we will fix an ordinal ℓ and assume that the key polynomials $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+1}$ are already defined. We will then define the next key polynomial $Q_{\ell+1}$. Roughly speaking, $Q_{\ell+1}$ will be defined to be the lifting to $K[x]$ of the monic minimal polynomial, satisfied by $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} Q_\ell$ over the graded algebra $G_\nu\left[\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\mathbf{Q}_\ell\right]$, where $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} Q_\ell$ denotes the natural image of Q_ℓ in $G_{\nu'}$.

In §4 we study the effect of differential operators $\frac{1}{j!}\frac{\partial^j}{\partial x^j}$ on key polynomials and standard expansions. Let ∂_j denote the differential operator $\frac{1}{j!}\frac{\partial^j}{\partial x^j}$. Let j denote the element of $\mathbb{N}$ which maximizes the quantity $\frac{\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_j Q_i)}{j}$. We show that j is of the form

$$j = p^{e_i} \quad \text{for some } e_i \in \mathbb{N}_0. \tag{1.5}$$

The non-negative integers e_i, $i \in \Lambda$, are important numerical characters of the extension ι of valued fields. Most importantly, given an ℓ-standard monomial $c_{\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}} \mathbf{Q}_{\ell+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}}$, we derive an explicit formula for the quantity

$$\nu'\left(\partial_{p^b} c_{\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}} \mathbf{Q}_{\ell+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}}\right) = \nu_\ell\left(\partial_{p^b} c_{\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}} \mathbf{Q}_{\ell+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}}\right),$$

for integers $b \geq e_i$, and under certain additional conditions. Also, for any ℓ-standard expansion f and an integer $b \geq e_i$, we derive a formula for $\nu_\ell(\partial_{p^b} f)$. We give a necessary condition for the equality $\nu'(\partial_{p^b} f) = \nu_\ell(\partial_{p^b} f)$ to hold.

The importance of this type of explicit formulae can be explained as follows. The importance of differential operators for resolution of singularities is well known. One difficulty with dealing with differential operators up to now has been the fact that they obey no simple transformation law under blowing up. Since key polynomials become coordinates after blowing up, the above formulae can be viewed as comparison results for derivatives of the defining equations of a singularity before and after blowing up.

In §5 we associate to each $h \in K[x]$ and each ordinal i for which Q_i is defined, a pair $(\delta_i(h), \epsilon_i(h))$ of positive integer numerical characters of the Newton polygon $\Delta_i(h)$. We prove

that the pair $(\delta_i(h), \epsilon_i(h))$ is non-increasing in the lexicographical ordering, and hence must stabilize for $i \gg 0$. We also show that the equality

$$(\delta_i(h), \epsilon_i(h)) = (\delta_{i+1}(h), \epsilon_{i+1}(h))$$

imposes strong restrictions on h. The numerical character $(\delta_i(h), \epsilon_i(h))$ helps analyze infinite ascending sequences $\{Q_i\}_{i\in\Lambda}$ in §6.

In §6 we use the above numerical characters to study the situation when our recursive algorithm does not stop after finitely many steps, that is, when it gives rise to an infinite sequence $\{Q_{\ell+t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ of key polynomials. This will end the construction of key polynomials in the case char $k_\nu = 0$. We then use the results of §4 to show that the stable value $\delta_i(f)$ must be of the form $\delta_i(f) = p^e$ for some $e \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

In particular, (Proposition 6.6) that if char $k_\nu = 0$ then there are no limit key polynomials Q_i such that $\beta_i \in \Gamma \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$. By definition, we will have $\beta_i \in \Gamma \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$ whenever i is not a maximal element of Λ. The set Λ contains a maximal element λ if and only if it contains an element λ such that $\mathrm{in}_\nu Q_\lambda$ is transcendental over $k_\nu[\mathrm{in}_\nu \mathbf{Q}_\lambda]$, where $\mathbf{Q}_\lambda = \{Q_i\}_{i<\lambda}$.

In §7 we assume that char $k_\nu = p > 0$ and consider an ordinal ℓ which does not have an immediate predecessor. We assume that the key polynomials $\mathbf{Q}_\ell$ are already defined and define the next key polynomial Q_ℓ. We show that this case can occur at most ω times.

We also give an explicit description of limit key polynomials; we show that every limit key polynomial Q_ℓ can be written in the form

$$Q_\ell = Q_i^{p^{e_{n\ell}}} + \sum_{j=0}^{e_{n\ell}-1} c_{p^j\ell} Q_i^{p^j} + c_{0\ell}, \tag{1.6}$$

where $i < \ell$ and $c_{0\ell}$ and $c_{p^j\ell}$ are i-standard expansions not involving Q_i. Moreover, for each element $i' \in \Lambda$ satisfying $i < i' < \ell$ the key polynomial $Q_{i'}$ is of the form

$$Q_{i'} = Q_i - h_{i'} \tag{1.7}$$

where $h_{i'}$ is an i-standard expansion not involving Q_i.

In §7 we prove the main property of key polynomials $\{Q_i\}$: they form a complete set of key polynomials. As a Corollary we will obtain that the images of the key polynomials in $G_{\nu'}$ generate the field of fractions of $G_{\nu'}$ over the field of fractions of G_ν (Theorem 7.11).

The results of this paper are related to those contained in the paper [3] (see also [9]). However, there are some important differences, which we now explain. We chose to rewrite the whole theory from scratch for several reasons:

1. In [3] we work with an algebraic extension ι while for local uniformization we need to consider purely transcendental extensions. We note that the case of algebraic extensions can easily be reduced to that of transcendental ones using composition of valuations, so the theory presented here can be viewed as a generalization of [3].

2. Our main interest in [3] was to classify all the possible extensions ν' of a given ν; in the present paper we content ourselves with a fixed ν'.

3. The crucial formulae for $\nu_\ell(\partial_{p^b} f)$ were not made explicit in [3].

4. We take this opportunity to correct numerous mistakes which, unfortunately, made their way into the paper [3]: an inaccuracy in the definition of complete set of key polynomials, the failure to take into account the case of mixed characteristic, a mistake in the definition of the numerical characters e_i and many others which made the paper [3] unreadable.

2 Algebras graded by ordered semigroups

Graded algebras associated to valuations will play a crucial role in this paper. In this section, we give some basic definitions and prove several easy results about graded algebras. Throughout this paper, a "graded algebra" will mean "an algebra without zero divisors, graded by an ordered semigroup". As usual, for a graded algebra G, ord will denote the natural valuation of G, given by the grading.

Definition 2.1. Let G be a graded algebra without zero divisors. The **saturation** of G, denoted by G^*, is the graded algebra

$$G^* = \left\{ \frac{g}{h} \;\middle|\; g, h \in G,\ h \text{ homogeneous},\ h \neq 0 \right\}.$$

G is said to be **saturated** if $G = G^*$.

Of course, we have $G^* = (G^*)^*$ for any graded algebra G, so that G^* is always saturated.

Example 2.2. Let R be a ring and $\nu : R \to \Gamma \cup \{\infty\}$ a valuation, centered at a prime ideal of R. Let $\Phi = \nu(R \setminus \{0\})$. For each $\alpha \in \Phi$, consider the ideals

$$\begin{aligned} P_\alpha &:= \{x \in R \mid \nu(x) \geq \alpha\} \quad \text{and} \\ P_{\alpha+} &:= \{x \in R \mid \nu(x) > \alpha\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

P_α is called the ν-**ideal** of R of value α.

If $\alpha_1 > \alpha_2 > \dots$ is an infinite descending sequence of elements of Φ then $P_{\alpha_1} \subsetneqq P_{\alpha_2} \subsetneqq \dots$ is an infinite ascending chain of ideals of R. Thus if R is noetherian then the ordered set $\nu(R)$ contains no infinite descending sequences, that is, $\nu(R)$ is well ordered.

If I is an ideal in a noetherian ring R and ν a valuation of R, $\nu(I)$ will denote

$$\min\{\nu(x) \mid x \in I\}.$$

We now define certain natural graded algebras, associated to valuations. Let R, ν and Φ be as above. For $\alpha \in \Phi$, let P_α and $P_{\alpha+}$ be as in (2.1). We define

$$\mathrm{gr}_\nu R = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Phi} \frac{P_\alpha}{P_{\alpha+}}.$$

The algebra $\mathrm{gr}_\nu R$ is an integral domain. For any element $x \in R$ with $\nu(x) = \alpha$, we may consider the natural image of x in $\frac{P_\alpha}{P_{\alpha+}} \subset \mathrm{gr}_\nu R$. This image is a homogeneous element of $\mathrm{gr}_\nu R$ of degree α, which we will denote by $\mathrm{in}_\nu x$. The grading induces an obvious valuation on $\mathrm{gr}_\nu R$ with values in Φ; this valuation will be denoted by ord.

Next, suppose that (R, M, k) is a local domain and ν is a valuation with value group Γ, centered at R. Let K denote the field of fractions of R. Let (R_ν, M_ν, k_ν) denote the valuation ring of ν. For $\alpha \in \Gamma$, consider the following R_ν-submodules of K:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{P}_\alpha &= \{x \in K \mid \nu(x) \geq \alpha\}, \\ \mathbf{P}_{\alpha+} &= \{x \in K \mid \nu(x) > \alpha\}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

We define

$$G_\nu = \bigoplus_{\alpha \in \Gamma} \frac{\mathbf{P}_\alpha}{\mathbf{P}_{\alpha+}}.$$

Again, given $x \in K$, we may speak of the natural image of x in G_ν, also denoted by $\mathrm{in}_\nu x$ (since $\mathrm{gr}_\nu R$ is naturally a graded subalgebra of G_ν, there is no danger of confusion). Then ord is a valuation of the common field of fractions of $\mathrm{gr}_\nu R$ and G_ν, with values in Γ.

We have $G_\nu = (\mathrm{gr}_\nu R)^*$; in particular, G_ν is saturated.

Remark 2.3. Let G, G' be two graded algebras without zero divisors, with $G \subset G'$. Let x be a homogeneous element of G', satisfying an algebraic dependence relation

$$a_0 x^\alpha + a_1 x^{\alpha-1} + \cdots + a_\alpha = 0 \tag{2.3}$$

over G (here $a_j \in G$ for $0 \leq j \leq \alpha$). Without loss of generality, we may assume that (2.3) is homogeneous (that is, the quantity j ord $x +$ ord a_j is constant for $0 \leq j \leq \alpha$; this is achieved by replacing (2.3) by the sum of those terms $a_j x^j$ for which the quantity j ord $x +$ ord a_j is minimal), and that the integer α is the smallest possible. Dividing (2.3) by a_0, we see that x satisfies an *integral* homogeneous relation over G^* of degree α and no algebraic relation of degree less than α. In other words, x is *algebraic* over G if and only if it is *integral* over G^*; the conditions of being "algebraic over G^*" and "integral over G^*" are one and the same thing.

Let $G \subset G'$, x be as above and let $G[x]$ denote the graded subalgebra of G', generated by x over G. By Remark 2.3, we may assume that x satisfies a homogeneous integral relation

$$x^\alpha + a_1 x^{\alpha-1} + \cdots + a_\alpha = 0 \tag{2.4}$$

over G^* and no algebraic relations over G^* of degree less than α.

Lemma 2.4. *Every element of $(G[x])^*$ can be written uniquely as a polynomial in x with coefficients in G^*, of degree strictly less than α.*

Proof. Let y be a homogeneous element of $G[x]$. Since x is integral over G^*, so is y. Let

$$y^\gamma + b_1 y^{\gamma-1} + \cdots + b_\gamma = 0 \tag{2.5}$$

with $b_j \in G^*$, be a homogeneous integral dependence relation of y over G^*, with $b_\gamma \neq 0$. By (2.5),

$$\frac{1}{y} = -\frac{1}{b_\gamma}(y^{\gamma-1} + b_1 y^{\gamma-2} + \cdots + b_{\gamma-1}).$$

Thus, for any $z \in G[x]$, we have

$$\frac{z}{y} \in G^*[x]. \tag{2.6}$$

Since y was an arbitrary homogeneous element of $G[x]$, we have proved that

$$(G[x])^* = G^*[x].$$

Now, for every element $y \in G^*[x]$ we can add a multiple of (2.4) to y so as to express y as a polynomial in x of degree less than α. Moreover, this expression is unique because x does not satisfy any algebraic relation over G^* of degree less than α. □

Notation. If $\Delta \subset \Delta'$ are ordered semigroups and β is an element of Δ', $\Delta : \beta$ will denote the positive integer defined by

$$\Delta : \beta = \min\{\alpha \in \mathbb{N} \mid \alpha\beta \in \Delta\}$$

If the set on the right hand side is empty, we take $\Delta : \beta = \infty$.
(Note that if $\beta = 0$ then $\Delta : \beta = 1$).

Lemma 2.5. *Let G, G' be as in Remark 2.3 and x a homogeneous element of G'. Assume that the degree 0 part of G contains a field k and that G is generated as a k-algebra by homogeneous elements $w_1, \ldots, w_r$. Let $\beta_j = \text{ord } w_j$, $1 \leq j \leq r$, and let Δ denote the group $\Delta = \{\text{ord } y \mid y \in G^*\} \equiv \left\{ \sum_{j=1}^{r} \alpha_j \beta_j \;\middle|\; \alpha_j \in \mathbb{Z} \right\}$. Assume that the following two conditions hold:*

(1) $\Delta : (\text{ord } x) < \infty$

(2) Let $\bar{\alpha} := \Delta : \text{ord } x$. *Let* $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r \in \mathbb{Z}$ *be such that*

$$\bar{\alpha} \text{ ord } x = \sum_{j=1}^{r} \alpha_j \beta_j. \tag{2.7}$$

Let $y = \prod_{j=1}^{r} w_j^{\alpha_j}$. *We require that the element*

$$z := \frac{x^{\bar{\alpha}}}{y} \in (G')^* \tag{2.8}$$

be algebraic over k.

Then x is integral over G^*. An integral dependence relation of x over G^* can be described as follows. Let z be as in (2.8). Let Z be an independent variable and let

$$\lambda(Z) = Z^d + \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} c_i Z^i = 0 \tag{2.9}$$

denote the minimal polynomial of z over k. Then x satisfies the integral dependence relation

$$x^{d\bar{\alpha}} + \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} c_i y^{d-i} x^{i\bar{\alpha}} = 0. \tag{2.10}$$

Conversely, suppose x is integral over G^*. Then (1) holds. Suppose, furthermore, that $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r$ are $\mathbb{Z}$-linearly independent. Then (2) also holds. In this case, (2.10) is the minimal polynomial of x over G^*. In particular, the degree α of the minimal polynomial of x over G^* is given by

$$\alpha = d\bar{\alpha}. \tag{2.11}$$

Proof. If (1) and (2) hold, x is integral over G^* because it satisfies the integral dependence relation (2.10) (this is verified immediately by substituting (2.8) for Z in (2.9) and multiplying through by y^d). In particular, if α denotes the degree of x over G^*, (2.10) shows that

$$\alpha \leq d\bar{\alpha}. \tag{2.12}$$

Conversely, suppose x is integral over G^*. Then x satisfies a homogeneous integral relation of the form (2.4). Since (2.4) is homogeneous, we have the equality

$$i \text{ ord } x + \text{ord } a_i = j \text{ ord } x + \text{ord } a_j \text{ for some } i, j \text{ such that } 0 \leq i < j \leq \alpha.$$

Hence

$$(j - i)\text{ord } x = \text{ord } a_i - \text{ord } a_j. \tag{2.13}$$

Now, $\frac{a_i}{a_j} \in G^*$ so that

$$\text{ord } a_i - \text{ord } a_j = \text{ord}\frac{a_i}{a_j} \in \Delta. \tag{2.14}$$

Putting together (2.13) and (2.14), we obtain (1) of the Lemma.

Now, assume that $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r$ are $\mathbb{Z}$-linearly independent. We wish to prove (2). Since $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r$ are $\mathbb{Z}$-linearly independent, all the monomials $w_1^{\gamma_1} \ldots w_r^{\gamma_r}$, $\gamma_j \in \mathbb{Z}$, have different values with respect to ord. Since (2.4) is homogeneous with respect to ord, each a_i must be a *monomial* in the w_j with (not necessarily positive) integer exponents. Also by the $\mathbb{Z}$-linear independence of $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r$, the coefficients $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_r$ in (2.7) are uniquely determined. Moreover, any relation of the form

$$i \text{ ord } x - \sum_{j=1}^{r} \alpha'_j \beta_j = 0, \quad i \in \mathbb{N},\ \alpha'_1, \ldots, \alpha'_r \in \mathbb{Z} \tag{2.15}$$

is a positive integer multiple of the relation

$$\bar{\alpha} \text{ ord } x - \sum_{j=1}^{r} \alpha_j \beta_j = 0. \tag{2.16}$$

This proves that x^i may appear in (2.4) only if $\bar{\alpha} \mid i$; in particular, $\bar{\alpha} \mid \alpha$. Let $d' := \frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha}}$. Let $0 \leq i < d'$. To find the coefficient $a_{i\bar{\alpha}}$ in (2.4), note that

$$\alpha \text{ ord } x = d'\ \bar{\alpha} \text{ ord } x = i\ \bar{\alpha} \text{ ord } x + \text{ord } a_{i\bar{\alpha}},$$

so that

$$(d' - i)\ \bar{\alpha} \text{ ord } x = \text{ord } a_{i\bar{\alpha}}. \tag{2.17}$$

Since $a_{i\bar{\alpha}}$ is a monomial in $w_1, \ldots, w_r$, (2.17) gives rise to a $\mathbb{Z}$-linear dependence relation of the form (2.15), which therefore must be equal to (2.16) multiplied by $d' - i$. This determines the monomial $a_{i\bar{\alpha}}$ uniquely up to multiplication by an element of k: we must have $a_{i\bar{\alpha}} = c_i y^{d'-i}$, where $c_i \in k$. Then $z \equiv \frac{x^{\bar{\alpha}}}{y}$ satisfies the algebraic dependence relation

$$z^{d'} + \sum_{i=0}^{d'-1} c_i z^i = 0. \tag{2.18}$$

This proves (2) of the Lemma. Now, we have shown that, under the hypothesis of linear independence of the β_j, if x has degree α over G^* then $\bar{\alpha} \mid \alpha$ and z satisfies a polynomial of degree $d' = \frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha}}$. Letting d denote the degree of z over k, as above, we obtain

$$d' \equiv \frac{\alpha}{\bar{\alpha}} \geq d. \tag{2.19}$$

Combining (2.19) with (2.12), we obtain (2.11); in particular, (2.10) is the minimal polynomial of x over G. This completes the proof of Lemma 2.5. □

Corollary 2.6. *Let G, $w_1, \ldots, w_r$ and $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r$ be as in lemma 2.5. If $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r$ are $\mathbb{Z}$-linearly independent in Δ then $w_1, \ldots, w_r$ are algebraically independent over k.*

Proof. Induction on r. For $r = 1$ there is nothing to prove. For the induction step, assume that the Corollary is true for $r = i$. If w_{i+1} were algebraic over $k[w_1, \ldots, w_i]$, we would have

$$(\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_i) : \beta_{i+1} < \infty \tag{2.20}$$

by lemma 2.5, applied to the graded algebra $k[w_1, \ldots, w_i]$ and the element w_{i+1}. (2.20) contradicts the linear independence of $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r$, and we are done. Alternatively, the Corollary can be proved by observing that by linear independence of $\beta_1, \ldots, \beta_r$, all the monomials in $w_1, \ldots, w_r$ have different degrees, thus any polynomial in $w_1, \ldots, w_r$ over k contains a unique monomial of smallest degree. Hence it cannot vanish. □

Definition 2.7. Let G be a graded algebra and $x_\Lambda := \{x_\lambda\}_{\lambda\in\Lambda}$ a collection of elements of G. Let k be a field, contained in the degree 0 part of G. Let $k[x_\Lambda]$ denote the k-subalgebra of G, generated by x_Λ. We say that x_Λ **rationally generate** G if $G^* = k[x_\Lambda]^*$.

The following result is an immediate consequence of definitions:

Proposition 2.8. *Let G_ν be the graded algebra associated to a valuation $\nu : K \to \Gamma$, as above. Consider a sum of the form $y = \sum_{i=1}^{s} y_i$, with $y_i \in K$. Let $\beta = \min_{1\le i\le s} \nu(y_i)$ and*

$$S = \{\, i \in \{1, \ldots, n\} \mid \nu(y_i) = \beta \}\,.$$

The following two conditions are equivalent:

1. $\nu(y) = \beta$
2. $\sum_{i\in S} \mathrm{in}_\nu y_i \neq 0$.

3 Key polynomials in simple transcendental extensions of valued fields

Let $K \to L \cong K(x)$ be a simple transcendental field extension, ν' a valuation of L and ν the restriction of ν' to K. We will assume that rk $\nu = 1$ and that

$$\nu'(x) > 0. \tag{3.1}$$

Definition 3.1. A **complete set of key polynomials** for ν' is a well ordered collection $\mathbf{Q} = \{Q_i\}_{i\in\Lambda}$ of elements of $K[x]$ such that for each $\beta \in \Gamma'$ the additive group $\mathbf{P}'_\beta \cap K[x]$ is generated by products of the form $a\prod_{j=1}^{s} Q_{i_j}^{\gamma_j}$, $a \in K$, such that $\sum_{j=1}^{s} \gamma_j \nu'(Q_{i_j}) + \nu(a) \ge \beta$. The collection $\mathbf{Q} = \{Q_i\}_{i\in\Lambda}$ is said to be 1-**complete** if for all $\beta \in \Gamma'_1$ any polynomial $f \in K[x]$ with $\nu'(f) = \beta$ belongs to the additive group generated by products of the form $a\prod_{j=1}^{s} Q_{i_j}^{\gamma_j}$, $a \in K$, such that $\sum_{j=1}^{s} \gamma_j \nu'(Q_{i_j}) + \nu(a) \ge \beta$.

Note, in particular, that if $\mathbf{Q}$ is a complete set of key polynomials then their images $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} Q_i \in G_{\nu'}$ rationally generate $G_{\nu'}$ over G_ν; if $\mathbf{Q}$ is a 1-complete set of key polynomials then their images $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} Q_i \in G_{\nu'}$ rationally generate $G_{\nu' 1}$ over G_ν. Furthermore, we want to make the set Λ as small as possible, that is, to minimize the order type of Λ.

Our algorithm amounts to successively and explicitly constructing key polynomials until the resulting set of key polynomials becomes complete for ν'. For an axiomatic definition of key polynomials see [6, 7, 8] and [9].

Take a polynomial $h = \sum_{i=0}^{s} d_i x^i \in K[x]$, $d_i \in K$.

Definition 3.2. The first **Newton polygon** of h with respect to ν is the convex hull $\Delta_1(h)$ of the set $\bigcup_{i=0}^{s}((\nu(d_i),i)+(\Gamma_+\oplus\mathbb{Q}_+))$ in $\Gamma\oplus\mathbb{Q}$.

To an element $\beta_1\in\Gamma'_+$, we associate the following valuation ν_1 of L: for a polynomial $h=\sum_{i=0}^{s}d_ix^i$, we put

$$\nu_1(h)=\min\{\nu(d_i)+i\beta_1\mid 0\le i\le s\}.$$

Consider an element $\beta_1\in\Gamma'_+$.

Definition 3.3. We say that β_1 **determines a side** of $\Delta_1(h)$ if the following condition holds. Let

$$S_1(h,\beta_1)=\{i\in\{0,\dots,s\}\mid i\beta_1+\nu(d_i)=\nu_1(h)\}.$$

We require that $\#S_1(h,\beta_1)\ge 2$.

Let $\beta_1=\nu'(x)$. Then for any $h\in K[x]$ we have

$$\nu_1(h)\le\nu'(h) \tag{3.2}$$

by the axioms for valuations. If equality holds in (3.2) for all $h\in K[x]$, we put $\Lambda=\{1\}$, $x=Q_1$ and stop. The definition of key polynomials is complete. From now on, assume that there exists a polynomial $h\in K[x]$ such that $\nu_1(h)<\nu'(h)$.

Proposition 3.4. *Take a polynomial $h=\sum_{i=0}^{s}d_ix^i\in K[x]$ such that*

$$\nu_1(h)<\nu'(h). \tag{3.3}$$

Then

$$\sum_{i\in S(h,\beta_1)}\mathrm{in}_\nu d_i\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}x^i=0.$$

Proof. We have

$$\sum_{i\in S(h,\beta_1)}d_ix^i=h(x)-\sum_{i\in\{0,\dots,s\}\setminus S(h,\beta_1)}d_ix^i,$$

hence

$$\nu'\left(\sum_{i\in S(h,\beta_1)}d_ix^i\right)>\nu_1(h).$$

Then $\sum_{i\in S_1(h,\beta_1)}\mathrm{in}_\nu d_i\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}x^i=0$ in $\frac{\mathbf{P}'_{\nu_1(h)}}{\mathbf{P}'^{+}_{\nu_1(h)}}\subset G_{\nu'}$ by Proposition 2.8. □

Corollary 3.5. *Take a polynomial $h\in K[x]$ such that $\nu_1(h)<\nu'(h)$. Then β_1 determines a side of $\Delta_1(h)$.*

Proof. If $S_1(h,\beta_1)$ consisted of a single element i, we would have

$$\mathrm{in}_\nu d_i\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}x^i\neq 0,$$

contradicting Proposition 3.4. □

Notation. Let X be a new variable. Take a polynomial h as above. We denote

$$\mathrm{in}_1 h := \sum_{i \in S_1(h,\beta_1)} \mathrm{in}_\nu d_i X^i.$$

The polynomial $\mathrm{in}_1 h$ is quasi-homogeneous in $G_\nu[X]$, where the weight assigned to X is β_1. Let

$$\mathrm{in}_1 h = v \prod_{j=1}^{t} g_j^{\gamma_j} \tag{3.4}$$

be the factorization of $\mathrm{in}_1 h$ into irreducible factors in $G_\nu[X]$. Here $v \in G_\nu$ and the g_j are monic polynomials in $G_\nu[X]$ (to be precise, we first factor $\mathrm{in}_1 h$ over the field of fractions of G_ν and then observe that all the factors are quasi-homogeneous and therefore lie in $G_\nu[X]$).

Proposition 3.6. *(1) The element* $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} x$ *is integral over* G_ν.

(2) The minimal polynomial of $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} x$ *over* G_ν *is one of the irreducible factors* g_j *of (3.4).*

Proof. Both (1) and (2) of the Proposition follow from the fact that $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} x$ is a root of the polynomial $\mathrm{in}_1 h$ (Proposition 3.4). □

Now let g_1 be the minimal polynomial of $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} x$ over G_ν. Let $\alpha_2 = \deg_X g_1$. Write $g_1 = \sum_{i=0}^{\alpha_2} \bar{b}_i X^i$, where $\bar{b}_{\alpha_2} = 1$. For each i, $0 \le i \le \alpha_2$, choose a representative b_i of $\bar{b}_i$ in R_ν (that is, an element of R_ν such that $\mathrm{in}_\nu b_i = \bar{b}_i$; in particular, we take $b_{\alpha_2} = 1$). Put $Q_2 = \sum_{i=0}^{\alpha_2} b_i x^i$.

Definition 3.7. The elements Q_1 and Q_2 are called, respectively, **the first and second key polynomials** of ν'.

Now, every element y of $K[x]$ can be written uniquely as a finite sum of the form

$$y = \sum_{\substack{0 \le \gamma_1 < \alpha_2 \\ 0 \le \gamma_2}} b_{\gamma_1 \gamma_2} Q_1^{\gamma_1} Q_2^{\gamma_2} \tag{3.5}$$

where $b_{\gamma_1\gamma_2} \in K$ (this is proved by Euclidean division by the monic polynomial Q_2). The expression (3.5) is called **the second standard expansion of** y.

Now, take an ordinal number greater than or equal to 3 which has an immediate predecessor; denote this ordinal by $\ell + 1$. If $\nu(\mathbb{N}) = 0$, assume that $\ell \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Assume, inductively, that key polynomials $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+1}$ and positive integers $\alpha_{\ell+1} = \{\alpha_i\}_{i \le \ell}$ are already constructed, that $\nu'(Q_i) \in \Gamma_1'$ for $i \le \ell$ and that all but finitely many of the α_i are equal to 1. We want to define the key polynomial $Q_{\ell+1}$.

We will use the following multi-index notation: $\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1} = \{\gamma_i\}_{i \le \ell}$, where all but finitely many γ_i are equal to 0, $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}} = \prod_{i \le l} Q_i^{\gamma_i}$. Let $\beta_i = \nu'(Q_i)$.

Definition 3.8. An index $i < \ell$ is said to be ℓ-**essential** if there exists a positive integer t such that either $i + t = \ell$ or $i + t < \ell$ and $\alpha_{i+t} > 1$; otherwise i is called ℓ-**inessential**.

In other words, i is ℓ-inessential if and only if $i + \omega \le \ell$ and $\alpha_{i+t} = 1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Notation. For $i < \ell$, let

$$\begin{aligned} i+ &= i + 1 && \text{if } i \text{ is } \ell\text{-essential} \\ &= i + \omega && \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

Definition 3.9. A multiindex $\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}$ is said to be **standard with respect to** $\alpha_{\ell+1}$ if

$$0 \leq \gamma_i < \alpha_{i+} \text{ for } i \leq \ell, \tag{3.6}$$

and if i is ℓ-inessential then the set $\{j < i+ \mid j+ = i+ \text{ and } \gamma_j \neq 0\}$ has cardinality at most one. An ℓ**-standard monomial in** $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+1}$ (resp. an ℓ**-standard monomial in** $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+1}$) is a product of the form $c_{\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}}\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}}$, (resp. $c_{\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}}\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}}$) where $c_{\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}} \in K$ (resp. $c_{\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}} \in G_\nu$) and the multiindex $\bar{\gamma}_{\ell+1}$ is standard with respect to $\alpha_{\ell+1}$.

Remark 3.10. In the case when i is ℓ-essential, the condition (3.6) amounts to saying that $0 \leq \gamma_i < \alpha_{i+1}$.

Definition 3.11. An ℓ**-standard expansion not involving** Q_ℓ is a finite sum S of ℓ-standard monomials, not involving Q_ℓ, having the following property. Write $S = \sum_\beta S_\beta$, where β ranges over a certain finite subset of Γ_+ and

$$S_\beta = \sum_j d_{\beta j} \tag{3.7}$$

is a sum of standard monomials $d_{\beta j}$ of value β. We require that

$$\sum_j \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} d_{\beta j} \neq 0 \tag{3.8}$$

for each β appearing in (3.7).

In the special case when $\ell \in \mathbb{N}$, (3.8) holds automatically for any sum of ℓ-standard monomials not involving Q_ℓ (this follows from Proposition 3.26 (2) below).

Proposition 3.12. *Let i be an ordinal and t a positive integer. Assume that $i+t+1 \leq \ell$, so that the key polynomials $\mathbf{Q}_{i+t+1}$ are defined, and that $\alpha_i = \cdots = \alpha_{i+t} = 1$. Then any $(i+t)$-standard expansion does not involve any Q_q with $i \leq q < i+t$. In particular, an i-standard expansion not involving Q_i is the same thing as an $(i+t)$-standard expansion, not involving Q_{i+t}.*

Proof. (3.6) implies that for $i \leq q \leq i+t$, Q_q cannot appear in an $(i+t)$-standard expansion with a positive exponent. □

We will frequently use this fact in the sequel without mentioning it explicitly.

Definition 3.13. For an element $g \in K[x]$, an expression of the form $g = \sum_{j=0}^{s} c_j Q_\ell^j$, where each c_j is an ℓ-standard expansion not involving Q_ℓ, will be called an ℓ**-standard expansion of** g.

Definition 3.14. Let $\sum_{\bar{\gamma}} \bar{c}_{\bar{\gamma}} \mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+1}^{\bar{\gamma}}$ be an ℓ-standard expansion, where $\bar{c}_{\bar{\gamma}} \in G_\nu$. A **lifting** of $\sum_{\bar{\gamma}} \bar{c}_{\bar{\gamma}} \mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+1}^{\bar{\gamma}}$ to $K[x]$ is an ℓ-standard expansion $\sum_{\bar{\gamma}} c_{\bar{\gamma}}\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+1}^{\bar{\gamma}}$, where $c_{\bar{\gamma}}$ is a representative of $\bar{c}_{\bar{\gamma}}$ in K.

Definition 3.15. Assume that $\mathrm{char}\, k_\nu = p > 0$. An ℓ-standard expansion $\sum_j c_j Q_\ell^j$, where each c_j is an ℓ-standard expansion not involving Q_ℓ, is said to be **weakly affine** if $c_j = 0$ whenever $j > 0$ and j is not of the form p^e for some $e \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Assume, inductively, that for each ordinal $i \leq \ell$, every element h of $K[x]$ admits an i-standard expansion. Furthermore, assume that for each $i \leq \ell$, the i-th key polynomial Q_i admits an i_0-standard expansion, with $i = i_0+$, having the following additional properties.

If i has an immediate predecessor $i-1$ in Λ (such is always the case if char $k_\nu = 0$), the $(i-1)$-st standard expansion of Q_i has the form

$$Q_i = Q_{i-1}^{\alpha_i} + \sum_{j=0}^{\alpha_i - 1} \left(\sum_{\bar{\gamma}_{i-1}} c_{ji\bar{\gamma}_{i-1}} \mathbf{Q}_{i-1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i-1}} \right) Q_{i-1}^j, \tag{3.9}$$

where:
(1) each $c_{ji\bar{\gamma}_{i-1}} \mathbf{Q}_{i-1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i-1}}$ is an $(i-1)$-standard monomial, not involving Q_{i-1}
(2) the quantity $\nu\left(c_{ji\bar{\gamma}_{i-1}}\right) + j\beta_{i-1} + \sum_{q<i-1} \gamma_q \beta_q$ is constant for all the monomials

$$\left(c_{ji\bar{\gamma}_{i-1}} \mathbf{Q}_{i-1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i-1}} \right) Q_{i-1}^j$$

appearing on the right hand side of (3.9)
(3) the equation

$$\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} Q_{i-1}^{\alpha_i} + \sum_{j=0}^{\alpha_i - 1} \left(\sum_{\bar{\gamma}_{i-1}} \mathrm{in}_\nu c_{ji\bar{\gamma}_{i-1}} \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} \mathbf{Q}_{i-1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i-1}} \right) \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} Q_{i-1}^j = 0 \tag{3.10}$$

is the minimal algebraic relation satisfied by $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} Q_{i-1}$ over $G_\nu[\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} \mathbf{Q}_{i-1}]^*$.

Finally, if char $k_\nu = p > 0$ and i does not have an immediate predecessor in Λ then there exist an i-inessential index i_0 and a strictly positive integer e_i such that $i = i_0+$ and

$$Q_i = c_{0i_0} + \sum_{j=0}^{e_i} c_{p^j i_0} Q_{i_0}^{p^j} \tag{3.11}$$

is a weakly affine monic i_0-standard expansion of degree $\alpha_i = p^{e_i}$ in Q_{i_0}, where each c_{qi_0} is an i_0-standard expansion not involving Q_{i_0}. Moreover, there exists a positive element $\bar{\beta}_i \in \Gamma_1' \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{Q}$ such that

$$\bar{\beta}_i > \beta_q \qquad \text{for all } q < i, \tag{3.12}$$

$$\beta_i \geq p^{e_i} \bar{\beta}_i \quad \text{and} \tag{3.13}$$

$$p^j \bar{\beta}_i + \nu(c_{p^j i_0}) = p^{e_i} \bar{\beta}_i \quad \text{for } 0 \leq j \leq e_i. \tag{3.14}$$

If $i \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we assume, inductively, that the i-standard expansion is unique. If char $k_\nu > 0$ and $h = \sum_{j=0}^{s_i} d_{ji} Q_i^j$ is an i-standard expansion of h (where $h \in K[x]$), we assume that the elements $d_{ji} \in K[x]$ are uniquely determined by h (strictly speaking, this does not mean that the i-standard expansion is unique: for example, if i is a limit ordinal, d_{ji} admits an i_0-standard expansion for each $i_0 < i$ such that $i = i_0+$, but there may be countably many choices of i_0 for which such an i_0-standard expansion is an i_0-standard expansion, not involving Q_{i_0} in the sense of Definition 3.11).

For each ordinal $i \leq \ell$ we define a valuation ν_i of L as follows. Given an i-standard expansion $h = \sum_{j=0}^{s_i} d_{ji} Q_i^j$, put

$$\nu_i(h) = \min_{0 \leq j \leq s_i} \{ j\beta_i + \nu'(d_{ji}) \}. \tag{3.15}$$

The valuation ν_i will be called the i-**truncation** of ν. Note that even though in the case when $\operatorname{char} k_\nu > 0$ the standard expansions of the elements d_{ji} are not, in general, unique, the elements $d_{ji} \in K[x]$ themselves are unique by Euclidean division, so ν_i is well defined. That ν_i is, in fact, a valuation, rather than a pseudo-valuation, follows from the definition of standard expansion, particularly, from (3.8). We always have

$$\nu_i(h) \leq \nu'(h). \tag{3.16}$$

For $b \in \mathbb{N}_0$, let ∂_b denote the differential operator $\frac{1}{b!}\frac{\partial^b}{\partial x^b}$. If $\operatorname{char} k_\nu = p > 0$ and i does not have an immediate predecessor, we assume, inductively, that for all $b \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\nu_{i_0}(\partial_b Q_i) = \nu'(\partial_b Q_i) \tag{3.17}$$

(where the notation is as in (3.11)).

Remark 3.16. If $i+1 \leq \ell$ is an ordinal having an immediate predecessor, it is also true that $\nu_i(\partial_b Q_{i+1}) = \nu'(\partial_b Q_{i+1})$ for all $b \in \mathbb{N}$, but, as we will see below (Proposition 3.26) this follows automatically from definitions; we do not need to make it into a separate assumption.

Proposition 3.17. *(1) The polynomial Q_i is monic in x; we have*

$$\deg_x Q_i = \prod_{j \leq i} \alpha_j. \tag{3.18}$$

(2) Let z be an i-standard expansion, not involving Q_i. Then

$$\deg_x z < \deg_x Q_i. \tag{3.19}$$

Proof. (3.18) and (3.19) are proved simultaneously by transfinite induction on i, using (3.9), (3.11) and (3.6) repeatedly to calculate and bound the degree in x of any standard monomial (recall that by assumption all but finitely many of the α_i are equal to 1). □

Proposition 3.18. *(1) For a pair of ordinals $i_0 < i \leq \ell$ such that $i = i_0+$ we have $\beta_{i_0}\alpha_i < \beta_i$.*

(2) The quantity $\frac{\beta_i}{\deg_x Q_i}$ is a strictly increasing function of i.

Proof. To prove (1), we distinguish the cases when i does or does not admit an immediate predecessor. If i admits an immediate predecessor then $i_0 = i-1$. In this case (1) follows from (3.9) and (3.10). If i does not have an immediate predecessor then (1) follows from (3.12) and (3.13), since $\alpha_i = p^{e_i}$.

(2) follows from (1) and (3.18) by transfinite induction on i. □

Corollary 3.19. *Take an ordinal $i \leq \ell$. If i does not admit an immediate predecessor, let i_0 be as in (3.11); otherwise, put $i_0 = i-1$. Consider the i_0-standard expansion (3.9) (resp. (3.11)), depending on whether or not i admits an immediate predecessor. Let $\left(c_{ji_0\bar{\gamma}_{i_0}} \mathbf{Q}_{i_0}^{\tilde{\gamma}_{i_0}}\right) Q_{i_0}^j$, with*

$$0 \leq j < \alpha_i, \tag{3.20}$$

be an i_0-standard monomial, appearing in one of these standard expansions. Then

$$\nu(c_{ji_0\bar{\gamma}_{i_0}}) > 0. \tag{3.21}$$

Proof. Since, by definitions, $\nu'\left(\left(c_{ji_0\bar{\gamma}_{i_0}}\mathbf{Q}_{i_0}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i_0}}\right)Q_{i_0}^j\right) \geq \nu'(Q_{i_0}^{\alpha_i})$ and in view of (3.20), it is sufficient to prove that

$$\nu'\left(\mathbf{Q}_{i_0}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i_0}}\right) < \beta_{i_0}. \tag{3.22}$$

Write $\mathbf{Q}_{i_0}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i_0}} = \prod_q Q_q^{\gamma_q}$. Using Proposition 3.18 (2), we see that

$$\nu'\left(\mathbf{Q}_{i_0}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i_0}}\right) = \sum_q \gamma_q\beta_q = \sum_q \gamma_q \deg_x Q_q \frac{\beta_q}{\deg_x Q_q} <$$
$$< \frac{\beta_{i_0}}{\deg_x Q_{i_0}} \sum_q \gamma_q \deg_x Q_q = \frac{\beta_{i_0}}{\deg_x Q_{i_0}} \deg_x \mathbf{Q}_{i_0}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i_0}}.$$

Since $\mathbf{Q}_{i_0}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i_0}}$ is an i_0-standard monomial, not involving Q_{i_0}, (3.22) now follows from Proposition 3.17 (2). This completes the proof. □

The rest of this section is devoted to the definition of $Q_{\ell+1}$. Take any element $h \in K[x]$ and let

$$h = \sum_{j=0}^{s_\ell} d_{j\ell} Q_\ell^j \tag{3.23}$$

be an ℓ-standard expansion of h, where each $d_{j\ell}$ is an ℓ-standard expansion, not involving Q_ℓ.

Definition 3.20. The ℓ-th Newton polygon of h with respect to ν is the convex hull $\Delta_\ell(h)$ of the set $\bigcup_{j=0}^{s_\ell}\left((\nu'(d_{j\ell}), j) + \left(\Gamma'_{1+} \oplus \mathbb{Q}_+\right)\right)$ in $\Gamma'_1 \oplus \mathbb{Q}$.

Consider the valuation ν_ℓ, defined in (3.15). If equality holds in (3.16) for all $h \in K[x]$, put $\Lambda = \ell + 1$ and stop. In this case, the definition of key polynomials is complete. From now on, assume that strict inequality holds in (3.16) for some $h \in K[x]$.

Notation. Let $\bar{Q}_\ell$ be a new variable and let h be as above. We denote

$$S_\ell(h, \beta_\ell) := \left\{ j \in \{0, \dots, s_\ell\} \;\middle|\; j\beta_\ell + \nu'(d_{j\ell}) = \nu_\ell(h) \right\}. \tag{3.24}$$
$$\mathrm{in}_\ell h := \sum_{j \in S_\ell(h,\beta_\ell)} \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} d_{j\ell} \bar{Q}_\ell^j; \tag{3.25}$$

The polynomial $\mathrm{in}_\ell h$ is quasi-homogeneous in $G\left[\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\mathbf{Q}_\ell, \bar{Q}_\ell\right]$, where the weight assigned to $\bar{Q}_\ell$ is β_ℓ.

Take a polynomial h such that

$$\nu_\ell(h) < \nu'(h). \tag{3.26}$$

Proposition 3.21. *We have* $\sum_{j \in S_\ell(h,\beta_\ell)} \mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\left(d_{j\ell}Q_\ell^j\right) = 0$ *in* $\frac{\mathbf{P}'_{\nu_\ell(h)}}{\mathbf{P}'_{\nu_\ell(h)+}} \subset G_{\nu'}$.

Proof. This follows immediately from (3.26), the fact that

$$\sum_{j \in S_\ell(h,\beta_\ell)} d_{j\ell}Q_\ell^j = h - \sum_{j \in S_\ell(h,\beta_\ell)\setminus\{0,\dots,s\}} d_{j\ell}Q_\ell^j$$

and Proposition 2.8. □

Let β_ℓ be a non-negative element of Γ'.

Definition 3.22. We say that β_ℓ **determines a side** of $\Delta_\ell(h)$ if $\#S_\ell(h,\beta_\ell) \geq 2$.

Corollary 3.23. *Let $\beta_\ell = \nu'(Q_\ell)$. Then β_ℓ determines a side of $\Delta_\ell(h)$.*

Proof. Suppose not. Then the sum $\sum_{j\in S_\ell(h,\beta_\ell)} \mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\left(d_{j\ell}Q_\ell^j\right)$ consists of only one term and hence cannot be 0. This contradicts Proposition 3.21; Corollary 3.23 is proved. □

Let

$$\mathrm{in}_\ell h = v_\ell \prod_{j=1}^{t} g_{j\ell}^{\gamma_{j\ell}} \tag{3.27}$$

be the factorization of $\mathrm{in}_\ell h$ into (monic) irreducible factors in $G_\nu\left[\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\mathbf{Q}_\ell\right]\left[\bar{Q}_\ell\right]$ (to be precise, we first factor $\mathrm{in}_\ell h$ over the field of fractions of $G_\nu\left[\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\mathbf{Q}_\ell\right]$ and then observe that all the factors are quasi-homogeneous and therefore lie in $G_\nu\left[\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\mathbf{Q}_\ell\right]\left[\bar{Q}_\ell\right]$).

Corollary 3.24. *The element $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}Q_\ell$ is integral over $G_\nu[\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\mathbf{Q}_\ell]$. Its minimal polynomial over $G_\nu[\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\mathbf{Q}_\ell]$ is one of the irreducible factors $g_{j\ell}$ of (3.27).*

Let $\alpha_{\ell+1}$ denote the degree of $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}Q_\ell$ over $G_\nu[\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\mathbf{Q}_\ell]$. Renumbering the factors in (3.27), if necessary, we may assume that $g_{1\ell}$ is the minimal polynomial of $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}Q_\ell$ over $G_\nu\left[\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\mathbf{Q}_\ell\right]$, so that

$$\alpha_{\ell+1} = \deg_{\bar{Q}_\ell} g_{1l}. \tag{3.28}$$

Write

$$g_{1\ell} = \bar{Q}_\ell^{\alpha_{\ell+1}} + \sum_{j=0}^{\alpha_{\ell+1}-1}\left(\sum_{\bar{\gamma}_\ell} \bar{c}_{\ell+1,j\bar{\gamma}_\ell}\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\mathbf{Q}_\ell^{\bar{\gamma}_\ell}\right)\bar{Q}_\ell^j, \tag{3.29}$$

Define **the $(\ell+1)$-st key polynomial** of ν' to be a lifting

$$Q_{\ell+1} = Q_\ell^{\alpha_{\ell+1}} + \sum_{j=0}^{\alpha_{\ell+1}-1}\left(\sum_{\bar{\gamma}_\ell} c_{\ell+1,j\bar{\gamma}_\ell}\mathbf{Q}_\ell^{\bar{\gamma}_\ell}\right)Q_\ell^j \tag{3.30}$$

of (3.29) to $K[x]$. In the special case when $\alpha_{\ell+1} = 1$, some additional conditions must be imposed on the lifting (3.30). In fact, in this case we will define several consecutive key polynomials at the same time. We will now explain what these additional conditions are, after making some general remarks.

Remark 3.25. Since $g_{1\ell}$ is an irreducible polynomial in $\bar{Q}_\ell$ by definition, the key polynomial $Q_{\ell+1}$ is also irreducible (for a non-trivial factorization of $Q_{\ell+1}$ would give rise to a non-trivial factorization of $g_{1\ell}$).

Proposition 3.26. *Take an element h of $K[x]$ and an ordinal $i \leq \ell$. Assume that one of the following conditions holds:*

(1)

$$\nu'(h) < \beta_i \tag{3.31}$$

and h admits an i-standard expansion

$$h = \sum_{j=0}^{s} c_j Q_i^j, \tag{3.32}$$

such that

$$\nu'(c_j) \geq 0 \quad \textit{for all } j. \tag{3.33}$$

(2) $\deg_x h < \deg_x Q_{i+1} = \prod_{q=0}^{i+1} \alpha_q$.

Then $\nu'(h) = \nu_i(h)$.

Proof. Let (3.32) be an i-standard expansion of h, where in case (1) we assume that (3.33) holds. By definition of standard expansion, each c_i in (3.32) is an i-standard expansion not involving Q_i. Then c_j is a sum of monomials in $\mathbf{Q}_i$, which does not vanish in $G_{\nu'}$ (3.8), hence all the monomials appearing in c_j have value at least $\nu'(c_j)$ (in other words, $\nu_i(c_j) = \nu'(c_j)$).

(1) By (3.31) and (3.33),

$$\nu'\left(c_j Q_i^j\right) = \nu_i\left(c_j Q_i^j\right) > \nu'(h) \qquad \text{for } j > 0. \tag{3.34}$$

(3.32) and (3.34) imply that $\nu'(h) = \nu'(c_0)$. Thus h is a sum of monomials in $\mathbf{Q}_{i+1}$ of value at least $\nu'(h)$, as desired.

(2) Let $S(h, \beta_i)$ be as in (3.24). Let $\bar{c}_j := \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} c_j$. Since the degree of $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} Q_i$ over $G_\nu[\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} \mathbf{Q}_i]^*$ is α_{i+1}, we see, using the assumption on $\deg_x h$, that $\sum_{j=0}^{s} \bar{c}_j \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} Q_i^j \neq 0$ in $G_{\nu'}$. The result now follows from Proposition 2.8.

□

We will now describe the additional conditions we impose on the lifting (3.30) in the case when $\alpha_{\ell+1} = 1$. Assume that $\alpha_{\ell+1} = 1$. In what follows, we will consider ℓ-standard expansions of the form

$$Q' = Q_\ell + z_\ell + \cdots + z_i, \tag{3.35}$$

where each z_j is a homogeneous ℓ-standard expansion, not involving Q_ℓ, such that

$$\beta_\ell = \nu'(z_\ell) < \nu'(z_{\ell+1}) < \cdots < \nu'(z_i). \tag{3.36}$$

Remark 3.27. Note that by (3.19), we have $\deg_x z_q < \deg_x Q_\ell$ for all q.

Let T denote the set of all the ℓ-standard expansions of the form (3.35), where each z_j is a homogeneous ℓ-standard expansion, not involving Q_ℓ, such that the inequalities (3.36) hold and $\nu'(z_i) < \nu'(Q')$.

We impose the following partial ordering on T. Given an element

$$Q' = Q_\ell + z_\ell + \cdots + z_i \in T$$

with $i > \ell$, we declare its immediate predecessor in T to be the element $Q_\ell + z_\ell + \cdots + z_{i-1}$. By definition, our partial ordering is the coarsest one among those in which $Q_\ell + z_\ell + \cdots + z_{i-1}$ precedes $Q_\ell + z_\ell + \cdots + z_i$ for all the elements Q' as above.

Remark 3.28. Take an element $Q' := Q_\ell + z_\ell + \cdots + z_i \in T$. For each ordinal j with $\ell \leq j \leq i$, we have

$$\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}(Q_\ell + z_\ell + \cdots + z_{j-1}) = -\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} z_j; \tag{3.37}$$

in particular, $\nu'(Q_\ell + z_\ell + \cdots + z_{j-1}) = \nu'(z_j)$.

Proposition 3.29. *Consider two elements*

$$Q' = Q_\ell + z'_\ell + \cdots + z'_{i'}, Q'' = Q_\ell + z''_\ell + \cdots + z''_{i''} \in T.$$

Assume that

$$\nu'(Q') < \nu'(Q'').$$

Then there exists a standard expansion

$$Q''' := Q_\ell + z'_\ell + \cdots + z'_{i'} + z_{i'+1} + \cdots + z_{i'''} \in T$$

such that $Q''' > Q'$ *and* $Q''' = Q''$.

Proof. Let $w = Q'' - Q'$. We have

$$\nu'(w) = \nu'(Q') < \nu'(Q'').$$

Since $\deg\ w < \deg Q_\ell$, the ℓ-standard expansion of w does not involve Q_ℓ. Let

$$w = z_{i'+1} + \cdots + z_{i'''} \tag{3.38}$$

be the ℓ-standard expansion of w, where $z_{i'+1}, \ldots, z_{i'''}$ are homogeneous ℓ-standard expansions, not involving Q_ℓ. Put

$$Q''' = Q_\ell + z'_\ell + \cdots + z'_{i'} + z_{i'+1} + \cdots + z_{i'''}.$$

Then

$$Q''' = Q''$$

and the Proposition follows immediately. □

To define $Q_{\ell+1}$ in the special case when

$$\alpha_{\ell+1} = 1, \tag{3.39}$$

consider two cases:

Case 1. The set T contains a maximal element. Let $Q' = Q_l + z_\ell + z_{\ell+1} + \cdots + z_{s-1}$ be such a maximal element, where each z_i is a homogeneous ℓ-standard expansion, not involving Q_ℓ, and s is an ordinal of the form $s = \ell + t$, $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Define

$$Q_i = Q_\ell + z_\ell + \cdots + z_{i-1} \qquad \text{for } \ell + 1 \le i \le s.$$

Case 2. The set T does not contain a maximal element. Let

$$\bar\beta = \sup\{\nu'(Q') \mid Q' \in T\}$$

(here we allow the possibility $\bar\beta = \infty$, which means that the set $\{\nu'(Q') \mid Q' \in T\}$ is unbounded in Γ'_1). In this case, Proposition 3.29 shows that there exists an infinite sequence $z_\ell, z_{\ell+1}, \ldots$ of homogeneous ℓ-standard expansions, not involving Q_ℓ, such that for each $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we have

$$Q_\ell + z_\ell + \cdots + z_{\ell+t} \in T \tag{3.40}$$

and $\lim\limits_{t\to\infty} \nu'(Q_\ell + z_\ell + \cdots + z_{\ell+t}) = \bar\beta$; pick and fix one such sequence. Define

$$Q_{\ell+t} = Q_\ell + z_\ell + z_{\ell+1} + \cdots + z_{\ell+t-1} \qquad \text{for } t \in \mathbb{N}_0.$$

Note that (3.36) and Remark 3.28 imply that the sequence $\{\nu'(Q_\ell + z_\ell + \cdots + z_{\ell+t})\}_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is strictly increasing.

For future reference, it will be convenient to distinguish two subcases of Case 2:

Case 2a. $\bar{\beta} = \infty$, that is, the sequence $\{\beta_{\ell+t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ is unbounded in Γ'_1.

Case 2b. The set $\{\nu'(Q') \mid Q' \in T\}$ has a least upper bound $\bar{\beta} < \infty$ (but no maximum) in Γ'_1.

Now, take any polynomial $h \in K[x]$. The $(\ell+1)$-standard expansion

$$h = \sum_{j=0}^{s} c_j Q_{\ell+1}^j$$

is constructed from the ℓ-th one by Euclidean division by the polynomial $Q_{\ell+1}$. Condition $\nu_\ell(c_j) = \nu'(c_j)$ required in the definition of standard expansion (cf. Definition 3.13 and (3.8)) follows immediately from Propositions 3.26 and 3.17 (2).

By induction on t, this defines key polynomials $Q_{\ell+t}$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$. If for some $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we obtain

$$\nu'(Q_{l+t}) \notin \Gamma'_1, \tag{3.41}$$

put $\Lambda = \ell + t + 1$ and stop. Below we will show that $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+t+1}$ is a complete set of key polynomials for ν'. Assume that

$$\nu'(Q_{\ell+t}) \in \Gamma'_1 \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{N}_0. \tag{3.42}$$

In this case we obtain an infinite sequence $\{Q_{\ell+t}\}$ of key polynomials. We denote the resulting set of key polynomials by $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+\omega}$. If $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+\omega}$ is a complete set of key polynomials, stop. The definition of the key polynomials $\{Q_i\}_i$ is complete.

Assume that $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+\omega}$ is not complete. Then there exists a monic polynomial h such that

$$\nu_{\ell+t}(h) < \nu(h) \tag{3.43}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Now, $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+\omega}$ is 1-complete if and only if

$$\nu(h) \notin \Gamma'_1 \tag{3.44}$$

for all h satisfying (3.43). In this case, define $Q_{\ell+\omega}$ to be the smallest degree monic polynomial h satisfying (3.43). The construction of key polynomials stops here. In §6 we will study further properties of $Q_{\ell+\omega}$ (see Propositions 6.5 and 6.8 and Remark 6.6). If $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+\omega}$ is not 1-complete (that is, if (3.44) does not hold) then $Q_{\ell+\omega}$ will also be defined as the smallest degree monic polynomial h satisfying (3.43), but we will require it to satisfy some additional conditions. A detailed definition will be given in §7.

Proposition 3.30. *If (3.42) holds and*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \beta_{\ell+t} = \infty, \tag{3.45}$$

the set $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+\omega}$ of key polynomials defined above is 1-complete. In other words, for any element $\beta \in (\Gamma'_1)_+$ any polynomial $f \in K[x]$ with $\nu'(f) = \beta$ belongs to the additive subgroup of $\mathbf{P}'_\beta \cap K[x]$ generated by all the monomials in the Q_i of value β or higher, multiplied by elements of K.

Proof. To prove Proposition 3.30, it is sufficient to show that for every positive $\beta \in \Gamma'_1$ and every $h \in K[x]$ such that $\nu'(h) = \beta$, h belongs to the R_ν-submodule of $K[x]$ generated by all the monomials $c\mathbf{Q}^{\bar{\gamma}}$ such that $\nu'(c\mathbf{Q}^{\bar{\gamma}}) \geq \beta$.

Take any element $h \in K[x]$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that, writing $h = \sum_{j=0}^{s} d_j x^j$, we have

$$\nu(d_j) \geq 0 \quad \text{for all } j \tag{3.46}$$

(otherwise, multiply h by a suitable element of K).

By (3.45), there exists i of the form $i = \ell + t$, $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$, such that

$$\beta_i > \nu'(h). \tag{3.47}$$

Let

$$h = \sum_{j=0}^{s_i} c_j Q_i^j \tag{3.48}$$

be the i-standard expansion of h. By (3.46), Corollary 3.19, and since (3.48) is obtained from h by Euclidean division by Q_i, the standard expansion (3.48) satisfies the hypotheses of Proposition 3.26 (1). Now, Proposition 3.26 says that

$$\nu_i(h) = \nu'(h).$$

This means, by definition, that h can be written as a sum of monomials in $\mathbf{Q}_{i+1}$ of value at least $\nu'(h)$, hence it belongs to the ideal generated by all such monomials. This completes the proof. □

Below (at the end of §7), we will see that the above construction produces a complete set of key polynomials whenever one of the following three conditions is satisfied:

(1) (3.41) holds for some $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$

(2) (3.42) holds and

$$\#\{\alpha_{\ell+t} \mid \alpha_{\ell+t} > 1\} = \infty \tag{3.49}$$

(3) $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+\omega}$ is 1-complete.

Moreover, we will see that (3.45) always holds whenever

$$char\ k_\nu = 0. \tag{3.50}$$

If $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+\omega}$ is not a 1-complete set of key polynomials (in particular, char $k_\nu = p > 0$, $\alpha_{\ell+t} = 1$ for $t \gg 0$ and $\lim_{t\to\infty} \beta_{\ell+t} < \infty$), we must continue the construction and define $Q_{\ell+\omega}, Q_{\ell+\omega+1}$, etc. This will be accomplished in §7.

In the next four sections, we analyze the case when the above construction gives rise to an infinite sequence $\{Q_{\ell+t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ of key polynomials.

4 Key polynomials and differential operators

This section is devoted to proving some basic results about the effect of differential operators on key polynomials. Here and below, for a non-negative integer b, ∂_b will denote the differential operator $\frac{1}{b!}\frac{\partial^b}{\partial x^b}$. Given an ℓ-standard expansion h, we are interested in proving lower bounds on (and, in some cases, exact formulae for) the quantities $\nu'(\partial_b h)$ and $\nu_\ell(\partial_b h)$ and the elements $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\partial_b h$ and $\mathrm{in}_\ell \partial_b h$. In particular, we will give sufficient conditions for the element $\partial_b h$ to be non-zero.

Take an ordinal $i \leq \ell$ having an immediate predecessor, so that the key polynomials $\mathbf{Q}_{i+1}$ are defined. Let b_i denote the smallest positive integer which maximizes the quantity $\frac{\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_i} Q_i)}{b_i}$ (later in this section, we will show that b_i is necessarily of the form p^{e_i}, for some $e_i \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and, in particular, that $b_i = 1$ if *char* $k_\nu = 0$).

Let h be any element of $K[x]$. One of our main tasks in this section is studying the quantities $\nu'(\partial_b h)$ and $\nu_i(\partial_b h)$. We use the following convention for binomial coefficients: if $s < t$, the binomial coefficient $\binom{s}{t}$ is considered to be 0. We may view the binomial coefficients as elements of K via the natural map $\mathbb{Z} \to K$.

Notation. If $p > 1$, for an integer a we shall denote by $\nu_p(a)$ the p-adic value of a, that is, the greatest power of p which divides a. If $p = 1$, we adopt the convention $\nu_p(a) = 1$ for all non-zero a and $\nu_p(0) = \infty$.

Proposition 4.1. *Take an element $h \in K[x]$.*

(1) We have for any $b \in \mathbb{N}_0$

$$\nu_i(h) - \nu_i(\partial_b h) \leq \frac{b}{b_i}\left(\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_i} Q_i)\right). \tag{4.1}$$

(2) Let $h = \sum_{j=0}^{s} d_{ji} Q_i^j$ be the i-standard expansion of h. Assume that $s > 0$. Let $d_{ji} Q_i^j$ denote the term in the i-standard expansion of h which minimizes the triple $\left(\nu_i\left(d_{ji} Q_i^j\right), \nu_p(j), j\right)$ in the lexicographical ordering. Let $e = \nu_p(j)$ and $b(i,h) = b_i p^e$. Then equality holds in (4.1) for $b = b(i,h)$.

Remark 4.2. Let $i_0 = i - 1$ if i admits an immediate predecessor and let i_0 be as in (3.11) otherwise. We have

$$\nu'(\partial_{b_i} Q_i) = \nu_{i_0}(\partial_{b_i} Q_i); \tag{4.2}$$

this holds by the induction assumption if i is a limit ordinal and by Proposition 3.26 (2) otherwise. Thus replacing $\nu'(\partial_{b_i} Q_i)$ by $\nu_{i_0}(\partial_{b_i} Q_i)$ in (4.1) gives rise to an equivalent inequality. Also, $\nu_i(\partial_b h) \leq \nu'(\partial_b h)$, so replacing $\nu_i(\partial_b h)$ by $\nu'(\partial_b h)$ in (4.1) gives rise to a true, but an a priori weaker inequality.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. We start with a lemma.

Lemma 4.3. *For any ordinal i' such that $Q_{i'}$ is defined and any $q \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $\nu'(\partial_q Q_{i'}) \geq 0$.*

Proof. This follows from Corollary 3.19 by transfinite induction on i'. □

We prove Proposition 4.1 by transfinite induction. For $i = 1$ we have $b_i = 1$ and the result is obvious. Assume that $i > 1$ and that the result is known for all the ordinals strictly smaller than i.

Lemma 4.4. *Consider a pair of ordinals i', i'' such that $i' < i'' \leq i$. Then*

$$\frac{\beta_{i'} - \nu'(\partial_{b_{i'}} Q_{i'})}{b_{i'}} < \frac{\beta_{i''} - \nu'(\partial_{b_{i''}} Q_{i''})}{b_{i''}}. \tag{4.3}$$

Proof. By transfinite induction on the ordinal $i'' - i'$, we may assume that $i'' = i'+$, and that $Q_{i''}$ admits an i'-standard expansion of the form (3.9) or (3.11), depending on whether or not i'' is a limit ordinal. By definition of $b_{i''}$, it is sufficient to prove that there exists a strictly positive integer $\tilde{b}$ such that (4.3) holds with $b_{i''}$ replaced by $\tilde{b}$.

We take $\tilde{b} := b\,(i', Q_{i''})$. We have:

$$\beta_{i''} - \nu'(\partial_{\tilde{b}} Q_{i''}) > \alpha_{i''}\beta_{i'} - \nu'(\partial_{\tilde{b}} Q_{i''}) = \nu_{i'}(Q_{i''}) - \nu_{i'}(\partial_{\tilde{b}} Q_{i''}) = \\ = \frac{\tilde{b}}{b_{i'}}(\beta_{i'} - \nu'(\partial_{b_{i'}} Q_{i'})).$$

Here the first inequality is given by Proposition 3.18 (1), the first equality by Remark 4.2 and the second equality by Proposition 4.1 (2) applied to $i' < i$, which we are allowed to use by the induction assumption. This completes the proof of the Lemma. □

To prove Proposition 4.1 (1), it is sufficient to prove it for each i-standard monomial appearing in the i-standard expansion of h. Let $\mathbf{Q}_{i+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i+1}}$ be such an i-standard monomial. Let $\bar{\gamma}_{i+1} = \{\gamma_j \mid j \leq i\}$ and write $\mathbf{Q}_{i+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i+1}} = \mathbf{Q}_i^{\bar{\gamma}_i} Q_i^{\gamma_i}$. Then

$$\partial_b \mathbf{Q}_{i+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i+1}} = \sum_{\substack{j_0+j_1+\cdots+j_q=b \\ q\leq\gamma_i}} C(j_1,\ldots,j_q) Q_i^{\gamma_i - q} \left(\partial_{j_0} \mathbf{Q}_i^{\bar{\gamma}_i}\right) \prod_{t=1}^{q} \left(\partial_{j_t} Q_i\right), \tag{4.4}$$

where $0 < j_1 \leq \cdots \leq j_q$ and $C(j_1,\ldots,j_q)$ stands for the number of distinct maps

$$\phi : \{j_1,\ldots,j_q\} \to 2^{\{1,\ldots,\gamma_i\}},$$

having the following properties:

(1) for each $t \in \{1,\ldots,q\}$, we have $\#\{\phi(j_t)\} = \#\left\{t' \in \{1,\ldots,q\} \mid j_t = j_{t'}\right\}$

(2) if $j_t \neq j_{t'}$ then $\phi(j_t) \cap \phi(j_{t'}) = \emptyset$.

For future reference, we give explicit formulae for $C(j_1,\ldots,j_q)$. Let $\{j_{c_1},\ldots,j_{c_\ell}\}$ with $c_1 < c_2 < \cdots < c_\ell$ denote the set of *distinct* natural numbers appearing among $\{j_1,\ldots,j_q\}$. For $1 \leq s \leq \ell$, let $a_s = \#\{t \in \{1,\ldots,q\} \mid j_t \leq j_{c_s}\}$. Then

$$C(j_1,\ldots,j_q) = \binom{\gamma_i}{a_1}\binom{\gamma_i - a_1}{a_2 - a_1}\cdots\binom{\gamma_i - a_{l-1}}{a_\ell - a_{\ell-1}} = \\ = \frac{\gamma_i!}{a_1!(a_2-a_1)!\ldots(a_\ell - a_{\ell-1})!(\gamma_i - a_\ell)!}. \tag{4.5}$$

We have

$$\beta_i - \nu_i(\partial_{j_t} Q_i) = \beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{j_t} Q_i) \leq \frac{j_t}{b_i}(\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_i} Q_i)) \tag{4.6}$$

by Remark 4.2 and definition of b_i and

$$\nu_i\left(\mathbf{Q}_i^{\bar{\gamma}_i}\right) - \nu_i\left(\partial_{j_0}\mathbf{Q}_i^{\bar{\gamma}_i}\right) = \nu_{i-1}\left(\mathbf{Q}_i^{\bar{\gamma}_i}\right) - \nu_{i-1}\left(\partial_{j_0}\mathbf{Q}_i^{\bar{\gamma}_i}\right) < \frac{j_0}{b_i}(\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_i} Q_i))) \tag{4.7}$$

where the equality holds because Q_i does not appear in $\mathbf{Q}_i^{\bar{\gamma}_i}$ and by Remark 4.2, and the inequality by the induction assumption and in view of Lemma 4.4. Adding the inequalities (4.6)

for $1 \leq t \leq q$ and (4.7), we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu_i\left(\mathbf{Q}_{i+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i+1}}\right) - \nu_i\left(Q_i^{\gamma_i - q}\left(\partial_{j_0}\mathbf{Q}_i^{\bar{\gamma}_i}\right)\prod_{t=1}^{q}\left(\partial_{j_t}Q_i\right)\right) \leq \\ &\leq \frac{j_0 + j_1 + \cdots + j_q}{b_i}(\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_i}Q_i)) = \frac{b}{b_i}(\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_i}Q_i)). \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

By (4.4) and (4.8),

$$\begin{aligned} &\nu_i\left(\mathbf{Q}_{i+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i+1}}\right) - \nu_i\left(\partial_b\mathbf{Q}_{i+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i+1}}\right) \leq \\ &\leq \nu_i\left(\mathbf{Q}_{i+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i+1}}\right) - \min_{(j_0,\ldots,j_q)}\left\{\nu_i\left(Q_i^{\gamma_i - q}\left(\partial_{j_0}\mathbf{Q}_i^{\bar{\gamma}_i}\right)\prod_{t=1}^{q}\left(\partial_{j_t}Q_i\right)\right)\right\} \leq \frac{b}{b_i}(\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_i}Q_i)), \end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

as desired. Proposition 4.1 (1) is proved.

Now let the notation be as in Proposition 4.1 (2). We can write $b = \sum_{t=1}^{q}\gamma_t$, where $q = p^e$ and $\gamma_t = b_i$ for all t. For each i-standard monomial $\mathbf{Q}_i^{\bar{\gamma}_i}$ not involving Q_i, appearing in d_{ji}, the corresponding term in (4.4) is $\binom{j}{p^e}Q_i^{j-p^e}\mathbf{Q}_i^{\bar{\gamma}_i}\left(\partial_{b_i}Q_i\right)^{p^e}$. Using the definition of b and the above explicit calculations of ∂_b applied to each generalized monomial in the i-standard expansion of h, we see that the i-standard expansion of $\partial_b h$ contains a term of the form $dQ_i^{j-p^e}$ with $\nu'(d) = \nu'((\partial_{b_i}Q_i)^{p^e}\, d_{ji})$, and all the other terms $d'Q_i^{j'}$ appearing in the i-standard expansion of $\partial_b h$ satisfy either $j' \neq j - p^e$ or $\nu_i(d'Q_i^{j'}) > \nu_i(dQ_i^{j-p^e})$. This proves that $\nu_i(\partial_b h) = \nu'(dQ_i^{j-p^e})$. □

Remark 4.5. Let

$$I_{i,max} = \left\{\tilde{b}_i \in \mathbb{N}_0 \;\middle|\; \frac{\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_i}Q_i)}{b_i} = \frac{\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{\tilde{b}_i}Q_i)}{\tilde{b}_i}\right\}. \tag{4.10}$$

By definitions, we have $b_i = \min\ I_{i,max}$. Of course, Proposition 4.1 holds equally well with b_i replaced by $\tilde{b}_i$. Similarly, Lemma 4.4 holds if the pair $(b_{i'}, b_{i''})$ is replaced by $(\tilde{b}_{i'}, \tilde{b}_{i''})$ with $\tilde{b}_{i'} \in \mathbb{N}$, $\tilde{b}_{i''} \in I_{i'',max}$.

Corollary 4.6. *For each ordinal $i \leq \ell$, each $\tilde{b}_i \in I_{i,max}$ is of the form $\tilde{b}_i = p^{\tilde{e}_i}$ for some $\tilde{e}_i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. In particular, $b_i = p^{e_i}$ for some $e_i \in \mathbb{N}_0$. In the special case when* char $k_\nu = 0$ *we have $p = 1$ and so $I_{i,max} = \{b_i\} = \{1\}$.*

Proof. Write $\tilde{b}_i = p^{\tilde{e}_i}u$, where $p \not| u$ if char $k_\nu = p > 0$, and $p^{\tilde{e}_i} = 1$ if char $k_\nu = 0$. We want to prove that $u = 1$. We argue by contradiction. Assume that $u > 1$. Then $\partial_{\tilde{b}_i}$ can be written as

$$\partial_{\tilde{b}_i} = \frac{b'!b''!}{\tilde{b}_i!}\partial_{b'} \circ \partial_{b''}, \tag{4.11}$$

where b', b'' are strictly positive integers such that

$$b' + b'' = \tilde{b}_i \tag{4.12}$$

and

$$\nu\left(\frac{b'!b''!}{\tilde{b}_i!}\right) = 0 \tag{4.13}$$

(as usual, we view $\frac{b'!b''!}{\tilde{b}_i!}$ as an element of K via the natural map $\mathbb{N} \to K$). Let $i_0 = i-1$ if i admits an immediate predecessor and let i_0 be as in (3.11) otherwise. We have

$$\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{\tilde{b}_i} Q_i) = (\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b''} Q_i)) + (\nu_{i_0}(\partial_{b''} Q_i) - \nu_{i_0}(\partial_{\tilde{b}_i} Q_i)) \tag{4.14}$$

by (4.2). By (4.11), we have $\partial_{\tilde{b}_i} Q_i = \frac{b'!b''!}{\tilde{b}_i!} \partial_{b'}(\partial_{b''} Q_i)$. Hence

$$\nu_{i_0}\left(\partial_{b''} Q_i\right) - \nu_{i_0}\left(\partial_{\tilde{b}_i} Q_i\right) \leq \frac{b'}{b_{i_0}}\left(\beta_{i_0} - \nu'\left(\partial_{\tilde{b}_{i_0}} Q_{i_0}\right)\right) < \frac{b'}{\tilde{b}_i}\left(\beta_i - \nu'\left(\partial_{\tilde{b}_i} Q_i\right)\right) \tag{4.15}$$

by (4.13), Proposition 4.1 and Lemma 4.4. From (4.14)–(4.15) we obtain

$$\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b''} Q_i) > \left(1 - \frac{b'}{\tilde{b}_i}\right)\left(\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{\tilde{b}_i} Q_i)\right) = \frac{b''}{\tilde{b}_i}\left(\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{\tilde{b}_i} Q_i)\right)$$

which contradicts the fact that $\tilde{b}_i \in I_{i,max}$. Corollary 4.6 is proved. □

Next, we investigate further the case of equality in (4.1). We give a necessary condition on h and b for the equality to hold in (4.1) and prove that this condition is sufficient under some additional assumptions. Finally, we derive a formula for $\mathrm{in}_i h$ in the case when this criterion for equality in (4.1) holds. We start with the case when h is a single i-standard monomial.

Proposition 4.7. *Consider an i-standard monomial $h = \mathbf{Q}_{i+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i+1}}$. Write*

$$b_i = p^{e_i} \qquad \text{and} \tag{4.16}$$

$$\gamma_i = p^e u, \qquad \text{where } p \nmid u \text{ if } \mathrm{char}\ k_\nu = p > 0. \tag{4.17}$$

(1) If equality holds in (4.1) then

$$p^{e+e_i} \mid b. \tag{4.18}$$

(2) We have the following partial converse to (1). Assume that (4.18) holds and that

$$\text{either} \quad b = p^{e+e_i} \quad \text{or} \quad I_{i,max} = \{b_i\}. \tag{4.19}$$

Then equality holds in (4.1) if and only if

$$\nu\left(\binom{u}{b/p^{e+e_i}}\right) = 0. \tag{4.20}$$

(3) Assume that (4.18)–(4.20) hold. Then

$$\mathrm{in}_i \partial_b \mathbf{Q}_{i+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i+1}} = \binom{u}{b/p^{e+e_i}} \mathrm{in}_i\left(\mathbf{Q}_i^{\bar{\gamma}_i} Q_i^{\gamma_i - \frac{b}{b_i}} \left(\partial_{b_i} Q_i\right)^{\frac{b}{b_i}}\right); \tag{4.21}$$

in particular, $\partial_b \mathbf{Q}_{i+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i+1}} \not\equiv 0$.

Remark 4.8. If $b = p^{e+e_i}$ holds in Proposition 4.7 (2) then $\frac{b}{p^{e+e_i}} = 1$ and $\binom{u}{b/p^{e+e_i}} = u$, so (4.20) holds automatically in this case.

Proof of Proposition 4.7. We go through the proof of Proposition 4.1 and analyze the case of equality at each step. We start with a general remark about binomial coefficients in positive and mixed characteristic.

Remark 4.9. If char $k_\nu = 0$, we have

$$\nu\left(\binom{\gamma}{j}\right) = 0 \tag{4.22}$$

for any non-negative integers $j \leq \gamma$; this implies that $\nu(C(j_1, \ldots, j_q)) = 0$ for any q-tuple $(j_1, \ldots, j_q)$ as in (4.4). If char $k_\nu = p > 0$, the following is a well known characterization of the equality (4.22). Let $\gamma = k_0 + pk_1 + \cdots + p^s k_s$ and $j = t_0 + pt_1 + \cdots + p^s t_s$, with $k_0, \ldots, k_s, t_0, \ldots, t_s \in \{0, 1, \ldots, p-1\}$, denote the respective p-adic expansions of γ and j (where we allow one of the $(s+1)$-tuples $(k_0, \ldots, k_s)$ and $(t_0, \ldots, t_s)$ to end in zeroes). Then (4.22) holds if and only if

$$k_j \geq t_j \quad \text{for all } j \in \{0, \ldots, q\}. \tag{4.23}$$

Below, we will be particularly interested in the following special cases of (4.23):

(1) If

$$\gamma = p^e u \quad \text{with } p \nmid u \tag{4.24}$$

then (4.22) implies that $p^e \mid j$.

(2) We have the following partial converse to (1): if γ is as in (4.24) and $j = p^e$ then (4.23) holds. In this case $\binom{\gamma}{j} = \binom{p^e u}{p^e} = u \bmod m_\nu$.

This is the main situation in which Proposition 4.7 will be applied in this paper.

Lemma 4.10. *(1) The inequality in (4.6) is strict unless $j_t \in I_{i,max}$.*

(2) Let γ_i and b_i be as in (4.16)–(4.17). Assume that $j_0 = 0$, and

$$j_t \in I_{i,max} \quad \textit{for } 1 \leq t \leq q. \tag{4.25}$$

If

$$\nu(C(j_1, \ldots, j_q)) = 0 \tag{4.26}$$

then

$$p^{e+e_i} \mid b. \tag{4.27}$$

(3) Let the assumptions be as in (2) and assume, in addition, that $b = p^{e+e_i}$. Then (4.26) holds if and only if $q = p^e$ and $j_1 = \cdots = j_q = b_i$.

Proof. (1) is immediate from definitions.

(2) Let $\{p^{c_1}, \ldots, p^{c_\ell}\} \subset I_{i,max}$ with

$$e_i \leq c_1 < c_2 < \cdots < c_\ell \tag{4.28}$$

denote the set of *distinct* natural numbers appearing among $\{j_1, \ldots, j_q\}$ (cf. (4.25) and Corollary 4.6). For $1 \leq j \leq \ell$, let $a_j = \#\{t \in \{1, \ldots, q\} \mid j_t \leq p^{c_j}\}$; let $a_0 = 0$. Then

$$b = \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} (a_j - a_{j-1}) p^{c_j}. \tag{4.29}$$

Assume that (4.26) holds. By (4.5) and Remark 4.9 (1), we have

$$p^e \mid a_j \quad \text{for } 1 \leq j \leq \ell. \tag{4.30}$$

(4.28)–(4.30) imply (4.27), as desired.

(3) Assume, in addition, that $b = p^{e+e_i}$.

"Only if". From (4.28)–(4.30), we see that $\ell = 1$ and $a_1 = p^e$; the result follows immediately.

"If". By assumptions, we have $\ell = 1 = q$ and $a_1 = p^e$. By (4.5) and Remark 4.9 (2), we have

$$C(j_1, \dots, j_q) = C(\underbrace{b_i, \dots, b_i}_{p^e}) = \binom{\gamma_i}{p^e} = u \mod m_\nu$$

and the result follows.

□

We can now finish the proof of Proposition 4.7.

By (4.7) and Lemma 4.10 (1), the inequality in (4.8) is strict unless $j_0 = 0$, and

$$j_t \in I_{i,max}. \tag{4.31}$$

Hence, by Lemma 4.10 (2), the first inequality in (4.9) is strict unless $j_0 = 0$ and $p^{e+e_i} \mid b$. This proves (1) of the Proposition.

(2) Assume that (4.18) holds. If $b = p^{e+e_i}$, by Lemma 4.10 (3) there is exactly one term on the right hand side of (4.4) for which equality holds in (4.8), namely, the term with $q = p^e$ and $j_1 = \dots = j_q = b_i$. If $I_{i,max} = \{b_i\}$, then by Lemma 4.10 (1) there is at most one term on the right hand side of (4.4) for which equality holds in (4.8); if such a term exists, it is the term with $q = \frac{b}{b_i}$ and $j_1 = \dots = j_q = b_i$. Moreover, this term satisfies equality in (4.8) if and only if $\nu(C(\underbrace{b_i, \dots, b_i}_{b/b_i})) = \nu\left(\binom{\gamma_i}{b/b_i}\right) = \nu\left(\binom{u}{b/p^{e+e_i}}\right) = 0$. In either case, there is at most one term on the right hand side of (10.4) for which equality holds in (4.8), and there is exactly one such term if and only if $\nu\left(\binom{u}{b/p^{e+e_i}}\right) = 0$. This proves (2).

(3) of the Proposition follows from (2) and (4.4). □

In the notation of Proposition 4.7, assume that (4.18) holds. Let

$$\gamma_i = k_0 + pk_1 + \dots + p^s k_s,$$

with $k_0, \dots, k_s \in \{0, 1, \dots, p-1\}$, denote the p-adic expansion of γ_i. Take integer $s' \in \{0, \dots, s\}$, $k'_{s'} \in \{0, \dots, k_{s'}\}$. Let $b = (k_0 + pk_1 + \dots + p^{s'-1}k_{s'-1} + p^{s'}k'_{s'})b_i$.

Corollary 4.11. *Equality holds in (4.1) for the generalized monomial $h = \mathbf{Q}_{i+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i+1}}$. The element $\mathrm{in}_i \partial_b \mathbf{Q}_{i+1}^{\bar{\gamma}_{i+1}}$ is given by the formula (4.21).*

Proof. Repeated application of Proposition 4.7 (2) and (3), first k_0 times with b replaced by 1, then k_1 times with b replaced by p, and so on. □

Let $h = \sum_{j=0}^{s} d_{ji} Q_i^j$ be an i-standard expansion. Let $S_i = S_i(h, \beta_i)$, where the notation is as in (3.24). Write $\mathrm{in}_i h = \sum_{j \in S_i} \mathrm{in}_i \left(d_{ji} Q_i^j\right)$. Write $b_i = p^{e_i}$, as above. Let e be the greatest non-negative integer such that for all $j \in S_i$ we have $p^e \mid j$.

Proposition 4.12. *(1) If equality holds in (4.1) then*

$$p^{e+e_i} \;\Big|\; b. \tag{4.32}$$

(2) Assume that

$$b = p^{e+e_i}. \tag{4.33}$$

Then equality holds in (4.1). In particular, we have $\partial_b h \not\equiv 0$.

(3) Assume that (4.33) holds. Let $S_{bi} = \left\{ j \in S_i \;\middle|\; p^{e+1} \text{ does not divide } j \right\}$ *Then*

$$\mathrm{in}_i \partial_b h = \sum_{j \in S_{bi}} \mathrm{in}_i \left(\binom{j}{p^e} d_{ji} Q_i^{j-p^e} \left(\partial_{b_i} Q_i\right)^{p^e} \right).$$

Proof. (1), (2) and (3) of Proposition 4.12 follow, respectively, from (1), (2) and (3) of Proposition 4.7. □

Corollary 4.13. *In the notation of Proposition 4.12, we have*

$$h \notin K\left[x^{p^{e+e_i+1}}\right]. \tag{4.34}$$

Proof. Take b as in (4.33). Now the result follows from Proposition 4.12 (2). □

Let the notation be as in Proposition 4.12.

Proposition 4.14. *Take an element* $j \in S_i$. *Write* $j = p^e u$, *where*

$$\textit{if} \quad \mathrm{char}\ k_\nu = p > 0 \quad \textit{then} \quad p \not| u.$$

Assume that

$$p^{e+1} \;\Big|\; j' \quad \textit{for all } j' \in S_i, j' < j. \tag{4.35}$$

Let $u = t_0 + t_1 p + \cdots + t_s p^s$ *be the p-adic expansion of u. Then*

$$\nu_i(\partial_{jb_i} h) = \nu_i(h) - j(\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_i} Q_i)), \tag{4.36}$$

$$\mathrm{in}_i \partial_{jb_i} h = \left(\prod_{q=1}^{s} t_q! \right) d_{ji} \left(\mathrm{in}_i \partial_{b_i} Q_i\right)^j + \textit{ terms involving } \mathrm{in}_i Q_i. \tag{4.37}$$

For any $j' \neq j$ *we have*

$$\frac{\nu_i(h) - \nu_i(\partial_{j'b_i} h)}{j'} \leq \frac{\nu_i(h) - \nu_i(\partial_{jb_i} h)}{j}, \tag{4.38}$$

and the inequality is strict whenever $j' \notin S_i$ *or* $j' < j$.

Proof. By (4.35) and Proposition 4.7 (1), terms of the form $d_{j'i} Q_i^{j'}$ with

$$j' \in S_i, j' < j$$

satisfy strict inequality in (4.1) with $b = jb_i$. Thus replacing h by $\sum_{j'=j}^{s} d_{j'i} Q_i^{j'}$ does not change the problem. Now apply Proposition 4.12 repeatedly $t_0 + t_1 + \cdots + t_s$ times. By (2) of Proposition 4.12,

$$\nu_i\left(\partial_{jb_i}\left(d_{ji} Q_i^j\right)\right) = \nu_i\left(d_{ji} Q_i^j\right) - j(\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_i} Q_i)) \tag{4.39}$$

and

$$\nu_i(\partial_{jb_i} h) = \nu_i(h) - j(\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_i} Q_i)), \tag{4.40}$$

this proves (4.36). (4.37) follows from Proposition 4.12 (3), by induction on u. Finally, the last statement of the Proposition follows from Proposition 4.12 (1) and (3), by induction on u. □

Remark 4.15. Here is an alternative, more explicit explanation of (4.37). Take $j' \in \{j, \dots, s\}$ and apply (4.4) to one of the generalized monomials appearing in $d_{j'i}Q_i^{j'}$ (we take $\gamma_i = j'$ and $b = jb_i$ in (4.4)), in order to decide which values of j' and which decompositions $j_0 + \cdots + j_q = b$ contribute to $\mathrm{in}_i \partial_b h$.

If either $j' > j$, $q \neq j$, $j_0 \neq 0$ or $j_t \neq b_i$ for some $t \in \{1, \dots, j\}$ then, by definition of b_i, the corresponding term in (4.4) is either divisible by Q_i or has ν_i-value strictly greater than $\nu_i\left(d_{ji}Q_i^j\right) - j(\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_i}Q_i))$. This proves (4.37).

Let $\sum_q c_{qi}Q_i^q$ denote the i-standard expansion of $\partial_{jb_i}h$. The above considerations prove that c_{0i} coincides with the coefficient of Q_i^0 in the i-standard expansion of $d_{ji}\left(\partial_{b_i}Q_i\right)^j$ modulo an element of higher ν_i-value. In particular, $c_{0i} \neq 0$ and

$$\nu'(c_{0i}) = \nu_i(c_{0i}). \tag{4.41}$$

We have

$$\nu'(c_{0i}) = \nu_i(\partial_{jb_i}h) = \nu_i\left(\partial_{jb_i}\left(d_{ji}Q_i^j\right)\right) = \nu_i\left(d_{ji}Q_i^j\right) - j(\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_i}Q_i)). \tag{4.42}$$

Corollary 4.16. *We have*

$$\nu_i(h) = \min_{0 \leq j \leq s}\{\nu_i(\partial_{jb_i}h) + j(\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_i}Q_i))\} \tag{4.43}$$

and the minimum in (4.43) is attained for all $j \in S_i$, satisfying (4.35).

5 The numerical characters $\delta_i(h)$ and $\epsilon_i(h)$

Let i be an ordinal such that Q_i is defined, and h an element of $K[x]$. Recall the definition of $\mathrm{in}_i(h)$ ((3.24)–(3.25)). In this section we define two numerical characters, $\delta_i(h)$ and $\epsilon_i(h)$, which will play a crucial role in the rest of the paper. We prove that the pair $(\delta_i(h), \epsilon_i(h))$ does not increase with i with respect to the lexicographical ordering. We also show that the equality $(\delta_i(h), \epsilon_i(h)) = (\delta_{i+1}(h), \epsilon_{i+1}(h))$ imposes strong restrictions on $\mathrm{in}_i h$. Decreasing $(\delta_i(f), \epsilon_i(h))$ strictly ensures that the algorithm stops after a finite number of steps.

Let $h = \sum_{i=0}^{s_i} d_{ji}Q_i^j$ be an i-standard expansion of h, where each d_{ji} is an i-standard expansion, not involving Q_i. The main definition of this section is: let

$$\delta_i(h) = \deg_{\bar{Q}_i} \mathrm{in}_i h \tag{5.1}$$

in the notation of (3.24)–(3.25).

Definition 5.1. The vertex $\left(\nu'\left(d_{\delta_i(h),i}\right), \delta_i(h)\right)$ of the Newton polygon $\Delta_i(h)$ is called the **pivotal vertex** of $\Delta_i(h)$.

Let

$$\nu_i^+(h) = \min\left\{\nu'\left(d_{ji}Q_i^j\right) \;\middle|\; \delta_i(h) < j \leq s_i\right\} \tag{5.2}$$

and

$$S_i'(h) = \left\{j \in \{\delta_i(h)+1, \dots, s_i\} \;\middle|\; \nu'\left(d_{ji}Q_i^j\right) = \nu_i^+(h)\right\}.$$

Let $\epsilon_i(h) = \max S_i'(h)$ (if the set on the right hand side of (5.2) is empty, we adopt the convention that $\nu_i^+(h) = \epsilon_i(h) = \infty$). It follows from definitions that $\epsilon_i(h) > \delta_i(h) \geq 0$. Furthermore, $\delta_i(h) > 0$ whenever $\nu_i(h) < \nu'(h)$.

Take an ordinal i such that Q_i and Q_{i+1} are defined. The fact that Q_{i+1} is defined means, by construction, that there exists a polynomial $h \in K[x]$ such that $\nu_i(h) < \nu'(h)$ (if $\nu_i(h) = \nu'(h)$ for all $h \in K[x]$, the algorithm stops at Q_i). Take a polynomial h such that $\nu_i(h) < \nu'(h)$. Consider the i-th Newton polygon of h. Let $S_i(h, \beta_i)$ be as in (3.24).

The next Proposition shows that the pair $(\delta_i(h), \epsilon_i(h))$ is non-increasing with i (in the lexicographical ordering) and that the equality $\delta_{i+1}(h) = \delta_i(h)$ imposes strong restrictions on $\mathrm{in}_i h$.

Proposition 5.2. *(1) We have*

$$\alpha_{i+1}\delta_{i+1}(h) \leq \delta_i(h). \tag{5.3}$$

(2) If $\delta_{i+1}(h) = \delta_i(h)$ then

$$\epsilon_{i+1}(h) \leq \epsilon_i(h) \quad \textit{and} \tag{5.4}$$

$$\mathrm{in}_i h = \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} d_{\delta_i(h),i} \left(\bar{Q}_i + \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} z_i\right)^{\delta_i(h)}, \tag{5.5}$$

where z_i is some i-standard expansion not involving Q_i, and $\mathrm{in}_{i+1} h$ contains a monomial of the form $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} d_{\delta_i(h),i} \bar{Q}_{i+1}^{\delta_i(h)}$; in particular,

$$\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} d_{\delta_i(h),i} = \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} d_{\delta_i(h),i+1}. \tag{5.6}$$

(3) If

$$(\delta_i(h), \epsilon_i(h)) = (\delta_{i+1}(h), \epsilon_{i+1}(h)) \tag{5.7}$$

then

$$\nu'(d_{\epsilon_i(h),i}) = \nu'(d_{\epsilon_i(h),i+1}). \tag{5.8}$$

Proof. We start with three Lemmas. First, consider the $(i+1)$-standard expansion of h:

$$h = \sum_{j=0}^{s} d_{j,i+1} Q_{i+1}^j, \tag{5.9}$$

where the $d_{j,i+1}$ are $(i+1)$-standard expansions, not involving Q_{i+1}.

Lemma 5.3. *(1) We have*

$$\nu_i(h) = \min_{0 \leq j \leq s} \nu_i\left(d_{j,i+1} Q_{i+1}^j\right) = \min_{0 \leq j \leq s} \{\nu'(d_{j,i+1}) + j\alpha_{i+1}\beta_i\}.$$

(2) Let

$$S_{i,i+1} = \left\{ j \in \{0, \ldots, s\} \;\middle|\; \nu_i\left(d_{j,i+1} Q_{i+1}^j\right) = \nu_i(h) \right\}$$

and $j_0 = \max\ S_{i,i+1}$. Then $\delta_i(h) = \alpha_{i+1} j_0 + \delta_i(d_{j_0,i+1})$.

Proof. (1) Provisionally, let

$$\mu = \min_{0 \leq j \leq s} \nu_i\left(d_{j,i+1} Q_{i+1}^j\right) = \min_{0 \leq j \leq s} \{\nu'(d_{j,i+1}) + j\alpha_{i+1}\beta_i\},$$

$$S'_{i,i+1} = \left\{ j \in \{0, \ldots, s\} \;\middle|\; \nu_i\left(d_{j,i+1} Q_{i+1}^j\right) = \mu \right\},$$

$j' = \max\ S'_{i,i+1}$ and $\delta' = \alpha_{i+1} j' + \delta_i(d_{j',i+1})$. We want to show that $\mu = \nu_i(h)$, $S'_{i,i+1} = S_{i,i+1}$, $j' = j_0$ and $\delta_i(h) = \delta'$.

Let $\bar{h} = \sum_{j \in S'_{i,i+1}} d_{j,i+1} Q_{i+1}^j$. Then $\nu_i(h - \bar{h}) > \mu$ by definition, so to prove that $\nu_i(h) = \mu$ it is sufficient to prove that $\nu_i(\bar{h}) = \mu$.

The i-standard expansions of both $\bar{h}$ and $d_{j',i+1} Q_{i+1}^{j'}$ contain a monomial of the form $dQ_i^{\delta'}$, with $\deg_x d < \deg_x Q_i$, and all the other monomials in both i-standard expansions either have value strictly greater than $\nu_i \left(dQ_i^{\delta'} \right)$ or have degree in x strictly smaller than $\deg_x dQ_i^{\delta'}$. Thus

$$\nu_i \left(\bar{h} \right) \leq \nu_i \left(dQ_i^{\delta'} \right) = \nu_i \left(d_{j',i+1} Q_{i+1}^{j'} \right) = \mu,$$

so $\nu_i(h) \leq \mu$. The opposite inequality is trivial and (1) is proved. (2) follows immediately from this. □

Lemma 5.4. *Consider two terms of the form dQ_{i+1}^j and $d'Q_{i+1}^{j'}$ (where $j, j' \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and d and d' are i-standard expansions not involving Q_i). Assume that*

$$\nu_i \left(dQ_{i+1}^j \right) \leq \nu_i \left(d'Q_{i+1}^{j'} \right) \tag{5.10}$$

and

$$\nu' \left(dQ_{i+1}^j \right) \geq \nu' \left(d'Q_{i+1}^{j'} \right). \tag{5.11}$$

Then $j \geq j'$. If at least one of the inequalities (5.10), (5.11) is strict then $j > j'$.

Proof. Subtract (5.10) from (5.11) and use the definition of ν_i and the facts that

$$\nu_i(Q_{i+1}) = \alpha_{i+1}\beta_i < \beta_{i+1},$$

$\nu_i(d) = \nu'(d)$ and $\nu_i(d') = \nu'(d')$. □

In the notation of Lemma 5.3, let $\theta_{i+1}(h) = \min\ S_{i,i+1}$.

Definition 5.5. The vertex $(\nu(d_{\theta_{i+1}(h),i+1}), \theta_{i+1}(h))$ is called the **characteristic vertex** of $\Delta_{i+1}(h)$.

Let

$$\mathrm{in}_i h = \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} d_{\delta i} \prod_{j=1}^{t} g_{ji}^{\gamma_{ji}} \tag{5.12}$$

be the factorization of $\mathrm{in}_i h$ into (monic) irreducible factors in $G_\nu \left[\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} \mathbf{Q}_i \right] \left[\bar{Q}_i \right]$, where $\delta = \delta_i(h)$ and g_{1i} is the minimal polynomial of $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} Q_i$ over $G_\nu \left[\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} \mathbf{Q}_i \right]$.

Lemma 5.6. *We have*

$$\gamma_{1i} = \theta_{i+1}(h) \tag{5.13}$$

(in particular, $d_{\gamma_{1i},i+1} \neq 0$) and

$$\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} d_{\theta_{i+1}(h),i+1} = \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} d_{\delta i} \prod_{j=2}^{t} g_{ji}^{\gamma_{ji}} (\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} Q_i). \tag{5.14}$$

Proof. Write

$$h = \sum_{q \in S_{i,i+1}} d_{q,i+1} Q_{i+1}^q + \sum_{q \in \{0,\dots,s\} \setminus S_{i,i+1}} d_{q,i+1} Q_{i+1}^q.$$

By Lemma 5.3,

$$\mathrm{in}_i h = \sum_{q \in S_{i,i+1}} \mathrm{in}_i d_{q,i+1} \mathrm{in}_i Q_{i+1}^q. \tag{5.15}$$

By definition of $\theta_{i+1}(h)$, $\mathrm{in}_i Q_{i+1}^{\theta_{i+1}(h)}$ is the highest power of $\mathrm{in}_i Q_{i+1}$ dividing

$$\sum_{q \in S_{i,i+1}} \mathrm{in}_i d_{q,i+1} \mathrm{in}_i Q_{i+1}^q.$$

Also by definition, we have

$$\mathrm{in}_i Q_{i+1} = g_{1i}. \tag{5.16}$$

Now (5.13) follows from (5.15). Also from (5.15), we see that $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} d_{\theta_{i+1}(h),i+1}$ is obtained by substituting $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} Q_i$ into $\frac{\mathrm{in}_i h}{\mathrm{in}_i Q_{i+1}^{\gamma_{1i}}}$, and (5.14) follows. □

Now, apply Lemma 5.4 to the monomials $d_{\theta_{i+1}(h),i+1} Q_{i+1}^{\theta_{i+1}(h)}$ and $d_{\delta_{i+1}(h),i+1} Q_{i+1}^{\delta_{i+1}(h)}$. We have

$$\nu' \left(d_{\delta_{i+1}(h),i+1} Q_{i+1}^{\delta_{i+1}(h)} \right) \leq \nu' \left(d_{\theta_{i+1}(h),i+1} Q_{i+1}^{\theta_{i+1}(h)} \right) \tag{5.17}$$

by definition of δ_{i+1} and

$$\nu_i \left(d_{\theta_{i+1}(h),i+1} Q_{i+1}^{\theta_{i+1}(h)} \right) = \nu_i(h) \leq \nu_i \left(d_{\delta_{i+1}(h),i+1} Q_{i+1}^{\delta_{i+1}(h)} \right) \tag{5.18}$$

by Lemma 5.3, so the hypotheses of Lemma 5.4 are satisfied. By Lemma 5.4

$$\theta_{i+1}(h) \geq \delta_{i+1}(h). \tag{5.19}$$

Since

$$\alpha_{i+1} \theta_{i+1}(h) = \alpha_{i+1} \gamma_{1i} \leq \deg_{\bar{Q}_i} \mathrm{in}_i h = \delta_i(h) \tag{5.20}$$

by Lemma 5.6 and (5.12), (1) of the Proposition follows.

(2) and (3). Assume that $\delta_{i+1}(h) = \delta_i(h)$. Then the above two monomials coincide and

$$\alpha_{i+1} = 1. \tag{5.21}$$

Furthermore, we have equality in (5.20), so $\mathrm{in}_i h = \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} d_{\delta_i(h),i} g_{1i}^{\delta_i(h)}$. Combined with (5.21), this proves (5.5).

To prove (5.4), we use (5.5) and (5.21). Let us compare the i-standard expansion

$$h = \sum_{j=0}^{s} d_{ji} Q_i^j \tag{5.22}$$

and the $(i+1)$-standard expansion (5.9) of h. Terms in (5.22) whose degree in Q_i is strictly less than $\epsilon_i(h)$ do not affect the monomial $d_{\epsilon_i(h),i+1} Q_{i+1}^{\epsilon_i(h)}$. We claim that the contribution to $d_{\epsilon_i(h),i+1} Q_{i+1}^{\epsilon_i(h)}$ of terms $d_{ji} Q_i^j$ in (5.22) satisfying $j > \epsilon_i(h)$, and hence

$$\nu' \left(d_{ji} Q_i^j \right) > \nu_i^+(h), \tag{5.23}$$

is of the form $dQ_{i+1}^{\epsilon_i(h)}$ where d is an $(i+1)$-standard expansion, not involving Q_{i+1}, with

$$\nu'(d) > \nu'\left(d_{\epsilon_i(h),i}\right).$$

Indeed, substitute $Q_{i+1} - z_i$ into $d_{ji}Q_i^j$. The contribution $dQ_{i+1}^{\epsilon_i(h)}$ of $d_{ji}Q_i^j$ to $d_{\epsilon_i(h),i+1}Q_{i+1}^{\epsilon_i(h)}$ has the property $\nu'(d) \geq \nu'\left(d_{ji}z_i^{j-\epsilon_i(h)}\right) = \nu'\left(d_{ji}Q_i^j\right) - \epsilon_i(h)\beta_i > \nu'\left(d_{\epsilon_i(h),i}\right)$ by (5.23).

Next, consider $j = \epsilon_i(h)$. Write

$$d_{\epsilon_i(h),i}Q_i^{\epsilon_i(h)} = d_{\epsilon_i(h),i}\left(Q_{i+1} - z_i\right)^{\epsilon_i(h)} = d_{\epsilon_i(h),i}Q_{i+1}^{\epsilon_i(h)} + d_{\epsilon_i(h),i}\sum_{j=1}^{\epsilon_i(h)}\binom{\epsilon_i(h)}{j}Q_{i+1}^{\epsilon_i(h)-j}z_i^j.$$

After Euclidean division by Q_{i+1}, the terms in $d_{\epsilon_i(h),i}\sum_{j=1}^{\epsilon_i(h)}\binom{\epsilon_i(h)}{j}Q_{i+1}^{\epsilon_i(h)-j}z_i^j$ may contribute to $d_{\epsilon_i(h),i+1}Q_{i+1}^{\epsilon_i(h)}$, but this has the effect of modifying $d_{\epsilon_i(h),i}$ by a polynomial of the same value but of *strictly* smaller degree.

Hence

$$\nu'(d_{\epsilon_i(h),i+1}) = \nu'(d_{\epsilon_i(h),i}) \tag{5.24}$$

and, in particular, $d_{\epsilon_i(h),i+1} \neq 0$. We now prove (5.4) by contradiction. Assume that $\epsilon_{i+1}(h) > \epsilon_i(h)$. By definitions,

$$\nu'\left(d_{\epsilon_{i+1}(h),i+1}Q_{i+1}^{\epsilon_{i+1}(h)}\right) \leq \nu'\left(d_{\epsilon_i(h),i+1}Q_{i+1}^{\epsilon_i(h)}\right),$$

so by Lemma 5.4 we have

$$\nu_i\left(d_{\epsilon_{i+1}(h),i+1}Q_{i+1}^{\epsilon_{i+1}(h)}\right) \leq \nu_i\left(d_{\epsilon_i(h),i+1}Q_{i+1}^{\epsilon_i(h)}\right).$$

Applying Lemma 5.3 to the polynomial

$$h' := \sum_{j=\epsilon_{i+1}(h)}^{s} d_{j,i+1}Q_{i+1}^j,$$

we see that its i-standard expansion contains a monomial $d'_{ji}Q_i^j$ with

$$\nu_i\left(d'_{ji}Q_i^j\right) \leq \nu_i\left(d_{\epsilon_i(h),i+1}Q_{i+1}^{\epsilon_i(h)}\right) \tag{5.25}$$

and

$$j \geq \epsilon_{i+1}(h) > \epsilon_i(h). \tag{5.26}$$

Since $\deg_{Q_i}(h - h') < \epsilon_{i+1}(h)$ we have $d'_{ji} = d_{ji}$, so (5.25)–(5.26) hold also for $d_{ji}Q_i^j$. This contradicts the definition of $\epsilon_i(h)$ and (5.4) is proved.

The equality (5.6) follows from (5.14) and the fact that $\theta_{i+1}(h) = \delta_{i+1}(h)$. (5.8) (assuming (5.7)) follows immediately from (5.24). This completes the proof of the Proposition. □

Remark 5.7. One way of interpreting Lemma 5.4, together with the inequalities (5.17)–(5.19) is that the characteristic vertex $(\nu'(d_{\theta_{i+1}(h),i+1}), \theta_{i+1}(h))$ of $\Delta_{i+1}(h)$ always lies above its pivotal vertex $(\nu'(d_{\delta_{i+1}(h),i+1}), \delta_{i+1}(h))$.

Now, assume that $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+1}$ is defined for a certain ordinal number ℓ and that ω iterations of the algorithm of §3 produce an infinite sequence $\{Q_{\ell+t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$.

Corollary 5.8 (of Proposition 5.2)**.** *Assume that the set* $\{t \in \mathbb{N} \mid \alpha_{\ell+t} > 1\}$ *is infinite. Then the set* $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+\omega}$ *of key polynomials constructed in §3 is complete.*

Proof. Take any element $h \in K[x]$. It is sufficient to show that $\nu_i(h) = \nu'(h)$ for some i of the form $\ell + t$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Proposition 5.2 (1) says that

$$\delta_{i+1}(h) < \delta_i(h) \tag{5.27}$$

whenever $\delta_i(h) > 0$ and $\alpha_{i+1} > 0$. Since the set $\{t \in \mathbb{N} \mid \alpha_{\ell+t} > 1\}$ is infinite, and the inequality cannot occur infinitely many times, we have $\delta_i(h) = 0$ for some $i = \ell + t$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $\mathrm{in}_i h$ does not involve $\bar{Q}_i$, hence $\nu_i(h) = \nu'(h)$. □

6 Infinite sequences of key polynomials

In this section, we assume that $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+1}$ is defined for a certain ordinal number ℓ, that ω iterations of the algorithm of §3 produce an infinite sequence $\{Q_{\ell+t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ and that $\alpha_{\ell+t} = 1$ for $t \gg 0$. Take an element $h \in K[x]$. Proposition 5.2 (1) implies that $\delta_{\ell+t}(h)$ stabilizes for t sufficiently large. Let $\delta(h)$ denote this stable value of $\delta_{\ell+t}(h)$. For a positive integer t, we have

$$\delta_{\ell+t}(h) = 0 \implies \nu'(h) = \nu_{\ell+t}(h) \implies \delta_{\ell+t+1}(h) = 0.$$

Assume that there exists $h \in K[x]$ such that $\nu'(h) > \nu_{\ell+t}(h)$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$ (in other words, $\delta_{\ell+t}(h) > 0$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$), and fix one such h. One of the two main results of this section is that if h is chosen to have the smallest possible degree then $\delta(h)$ has the form p^e for some $e \in \mathbb{N}_0$ (in particular, $\delta(h) = 1$ if $\mathrm{char}\, k_\nu = 0$). To prove this, we use the results of §4 on differential operators. The second main result is the statement that if either $\mathrm{char}\, k_\nu = 0$ or $p \not| \delta(h)$ then the sequences $\{\beta_{\ell+t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\nu_{\ell+t}(h)$ are unbounded in Γ'_1; in particular, the set $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+\omega}$ of key polynomials is 1-complete by Proposition 3.30.

Keep the above notation and assumptions. Replacing ℓ by $\ell + t$ for a sufficiently large t, we may assume that $\alpha_{\ell+t} = 1$ for all (strictly) positive integers t. Below the ordinal i will run over the set $\{\ell + t \mid t \in \mathbb{N}_0\}$. By definition, for all such i we have

$$Q_{i+1} = Q_i + z_i, \tag{6.1}$$

where z_i is a homogeneous ℓ-standard expansion of value β_i, not involving Q_ℓ (cf. Proposition 3.12). By Proposition 3.17 (2), we have

$$\deg_x z_i < \deg_x Q_i. \tag{6.2}$$

Finally,

$$\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} Q_i = -\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} z_i \tag{6.3}$$

by (3.37).

As before, let

$$h = \sum_{j=0}^{s_i} d_{ji} Q_i^j$$

be an i-standard expansion of h for $i \geq \ell$, where each d_{ji} is an ℓ-standard expansion, not involving Q_ℓ. Note that since $\alpha_{\ell+t} = 1$ for $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$, we have

$$\deg_x Q_i = \prod_{j=2}^{\alpha_i} \alpha_j = \prod_{j=2}^{\alpha_\ell} \alpha_j = \deg_x Q_\ell$$

and so

$$s_i = \left[\frac{\deg_x h}{\deg_x Q_i}\right] = \left[\frac{\deg_x h}{\deg_x Q_\ell}\right] = s_\ell. \tag{6.4}$$

Proposition 6.1. *For each i of the form $i = \ell + t$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $b_{i+1} \leq b_i$.*

Proof. Write $Q_{i+1} = Q_i + z_i$, as above.

Lemma 6.2. *For any $b \in \mathbb{N}$ we have*

$$\frac{\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_b z_i)}{b} < \frac{\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_i} Q_i)}{b_i}. \tag{6.5}$$

If, in addition, $b \geq b_i$, then

$$\frac{\beta_{i+1} - \nu'(\partial_b z_i)}{b} < \frac{\beta_{i+1} - \nu'(\partial_{b_i} Q_i)}{b_i}. \tag{6.6}$$

Proof. Let i' denote the smallest ordinal such that

$$\nu_{i'}(z_i) = \nu'(z_i); \tag{6.7}$$

by Proposition 3.26 (2), $i' < i$. Let $z_i = \sum_{j=0}^{s_{i'}} c_{ji'} Q_{i'}^j$ be the i'-standard expansion of z_i. By Lemma 4.4 we have

$$\frac{\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_i} Q_i)}{b_i} > \frac{\beta_{i'} - \nu'(\partial_{b_{i'}} Q_{i'})}{b_{i'}}. \tag{6.8}$$

Combining (6.8) with (4.1), we obtain

$$\frac{\nu_{i'}(z_i) - \nu_{i'}(\partial_b z_i)}{b} \leq \frac{\beta_{i'} - \nu_{i'}(\partial_{b_{i'}} Q_{i'})}{b_{i'}} < \frac{\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_i} Q_i)}{b_i}, \tag{6.9}$$

which gives the inequality (6.5). If $b \geq b_i$, (6.6) follows immediately by adding the inequality $\frac{\beta_{i+1} - \beta_i}{b} \leq \frac{\beta_{i+1} - \beta_i}{b_i}$ to (6.5). □

Corollary 6.3. *We have*

$$\nu'(\partial_{b_i} z_i) > \nu'(\partial_{b_i} Q_i) = \nu'(\partial_{b_i} Q_{i+1}). \tag{6.10}$$

Proof. The inequality in (6.10) is a special case of (6.5) when $b = b_i$. The equality in (6.10) follows immediately from the inequality. □

To prove Proposition 6.1, we argue by contradiction. Suppose that

$$b_{i+1} > b_i. \tag{6.11}$$

Letting $b = b_{i+1}$ in Lemma 6.2, we obtain

$$\frac{\beta_{i+1} - \nu'(\partial_{b_{i+1}} z_i)}{b_{i+1}} < \frac{\beta_{i+1} - \nu'(\partial_{b_i} Q_i)}{b_i}. \tag{6.12}$$

We have

$$\frac{\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_{i+1}} Q_i)}{b_{i+1}} \leq \frac{\beta_i - \nu'(\partial_{b_i} Q_i)}{b_i} \tag{6.13}$$

by definition of b_i. Combining (6.13) with (6.11), we obtain

$$\frac{\beta_{i+1}-\nu'(\partial_{b_{i+1}}Q_i)}{b_{i+1}}<\frac{\beta_{i+1}-\nu'(\partial_{b_i}Q_i)}{b_i}. \tag{6.14}$$

We can rewrite (6.12) and (6.14) as

$$\min\{\nu'(\partial_{b_{i+1}}Q_i),\nu'(\partial_{b_{i+1}}z_i)\}>\beta_{i+1}-\frac{b_{i+1}}{b_i}\left(\beta_{i+1}-\nu'(\partial_{b_i}Q_i)\right). \tag{6.15}$$

Since $\partial_{b_{i+1}}Q_{i+1}=\partial_{b_{i+1}}Q_i+\partial_{b_{i+1}}z_i$, (6.15) shows that

$$\nu'(\partial_{b_{i+1}}Q_{i+1})>\beta_{i+1}-\frac{b_{i+1}}{b_i}\left(\beta_{i+1}-\nu'(\partial_{b_i}Q_i)\right),$$

which contradicts the definition of b_{i+1}. This completes the proof of Proposition 6.1. □

By Proposition 5.2 (1), $\delta_i(h)$ is constant for all $i\gg\ell$. Let $\delta=\delta_i(h)$ for $i\gg\ell$. Write $\delta=p^eu$, where if $p>1$ then $p\not| u$.

First, assume that *char* $k_\nu=0$. Equations (3.27) and (5.5) imply that $d_{\delta-1,\ell}\neq 0$ and

$$g_{1\ell}=\bar{Q}_\ell+\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\frac{d_{\delta-1,\ell}}{\delta\ d_{\delta\ell}}. \tag{6.16}$$

Next, suppose char $k_\nu=p>0$. Then, according to Proposition 5.2 (2) and using the notation of (3.24), we see that for $i\geq\ell$

$$\delta-p^e\in S_i(h,\beta_i) \tag{6.17}$$

(in particular, $d_{\delta-p^e,i}\neq 0$) and that

$$\mathrm{in}_i z_i=\left(\frac{\mathrm{in}_i d_{\delta-p^e,i}}{u\ \mathrm{in}_i d_{\delta i}}\right)^{\frac{1}{p^e}} \tag{6.18}$$

Let $\delta=\delta_i(h)$. We have $v_\ell=\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}d_{\delta\ell}$ and (3.27) rewrites as

$$\mathrm{in}_\ell h=\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}d_{\delta\ell}g_{1\ell}^{\delta}. \tag{6.19}$$

Next, we prove a comparison result which expresses the coefficients d_{ji} in terms of $d_{j\ell}$ for $\delta-p^e\leq j\leq\delta$, modulo terms of sufficiently high value.

Proposition 6.4. *Take an integer $t>0$ and let $\ell_1=\ell+t$, $\ell_1<i$. Assume that*

$$\delta_{i+1}(h)=\delta_\ell(h)=\delta. \tag{6.20}$$

Take an integer $v\in\{\delta-p^e,\delta-p^e+1,\dots,\delta\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} d_{vi}\equiv&\sum_{j=0}^{\delta-v}(-1)^j\binom{v+j}{j}d_{v+j,\ell_1}(z_{\ell_1}+\cdots+z_{i-1})^j\\ &\mod\ \mathbf{P}'_{(\nu_{\ell_1}(h)-v\beta_{\ell_1})+\min\{\nu^+_{\ell_1}(h)-\nu_{\ell_1}(h),\beta_i-\beta_\ell\}}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.21}$$

In particular, letting $v=\delta-p^e$ and $v=\delta$ in (6.21) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} d_{\delta-p^e,i}\equiv&\sum_{j=0}^{p^e}(-1)^j\binom{\delta-p^e+j}{j}d_{\delta-p^e+j,\ell_1}(z_{\ell_1}+\cdots+z_{i-1})^j\\ &\mod\ \mathbf{P}'_{\nu'(d_{\delta-p^e,\ell_1})+\min\{\nu^+_{\ell_1}(h)-\nu_{\ell_1}(h),\beta_i-\beta_\ell\}}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.22}$$

and

$$d_{\delta i} \equiv d_{\delta l_1} \mod \mathbf{P}'_{\nu'(d_{\delta\ell_1})+\min\{\nu^+_{\ell_1}(h)-\nu_{\ell_1}(h),\beta_i-\beta_\ell\}}, \tag{6.23}$$

respectively. If $p^e = 1$ *(in particular, whenever char* $k_\nu = 0$*), (6.22) reduces to*

$$d_{\delta-1,i} \equiv d_{\delta-1,\ell_1} - \delta\ d_{\delta\ell_1}(z_{\ell_1} + \cdots + z_{i-1}) \mod \mathbf{P}'_{\nu'(d_{\delta-1,\ell_1})+\min\{\nu^+_{\ell_1}(h)-\nu_{\ell_1}(h),\beta_i-\beta_\ell\}}. \tag{6.24}$$

Proof. By definitions, we have $Q_i = Q_{\ell_1} + z_{\ell_1} + \cdots + z_{i-1}$. First, we will compare the ℓ-standard expansion of h with the i-standard one. To this end, we substitute $Q_{\ell_1} = Q_i - z_{\ell_1} - \cdots - z_{i-1}$ into the ℓ_1-standard expansion of h. We obtain

$$h = \sum_{j=0}^{s_{l_1}} d_{j\ell_1}(Q_i - z_{l_1} - \cdots - z_{i-1})^j = \sum_{j=0}^{s_{l_1}} d_{ji} Q_i^j. \tag{6.25}$$

We want to derive information about $\mathrm{in}_i h$ from (6.25). First note that for each $q \in \{0, \ldots, s_{\ell_1}-1\}$ we have $\deg_x \sum_{j=0}^{q} d_{j\ell_1}(Q_i - z_{\ell_1} - \cdots - z_{i-1})^j < (q+1)\deg_x Q_i$. Hence $d_{q+1,i}$ is completely determined by $d_{q+1,\ell_1}, d_{q+2,\ell_1}, \ldots, d_{s_{\ell_1}\ell_1}$. Next, for

$$\delta - v < j \le s_{\ell_1} - v$$

and $\ell_1 \le s \le i-1$, note that

$$\nu'\left(d_{v+j,\ell_1} z_s^j\right) \ge j\beta_{\ell_1} + \nu'(d_{v+j,\ell_1}) \ge \nu^+_{\ell_1}(h) - v\beta_{\ell_1}, \tag{6.26}$$

so for $\delta - v < j \le s_{\ell_1} - v$ the terms $d_{v+j,\ell_1} Q_{\ell_1}^{v+j}$ in (6.25) contribute nothing to

$$d_{vi} \mod \mathbf{P}'_{(\nu_{\ell_1}(h)-v\beta_{\ell_1})+\min\{\nu^+_{\ell_1}(h)-\nu_{\ell_1}(h),\beta_i-\beta_\ell\}}.$$

Now, the coefficients d_{vi} in (6.25) are obtained from $\sum_{j=0}^{s_{\ell_1}} d_{j\ell_1}(Q_i - z_{\ell_1} - \cdots - z_{i-1})^j$ by opening the parentheses (using Newton's Binomial Theorem) and then applying Euclidean division by Q_i; such a Euclidean division may change the coefficients d_{vi} by adding terms of value at least $\nu'(d_{v+j,l_1}) - (v-k)\beta_i + (v+j-k)\beta_{l_1}$ with $0 \le k \le v+j$. Using the definition of δ we observe that for v and j as in (6.21) we have $\nu'(d_{v+j,\ell_1}) \ge \nu'(d_{\delta\ell_1}) + (\delta - v - j)\beta_{\ell_1} = \nu_{\ell_1}(h) - (v+j)\beta_{\ell_1}$. This completes the proof of (6.21).

(6.22) and (6.23) follow from (6.21), after observing that

$$\nu_{\ell_1}(h) = \nu'(d_{\delta\ell_1}) + \delta\beta_{\ell_1} = \nu'(d_{\delta-p^e,\ell_1}) + (\delta - p^e)\beta_{\ell_1}$$

by (5.5). (6.24) is obtained from (6.22) by substituting $p^e = 1$. The Proposition is proved. □

Proposition 6.5. *Assume that there exists* $h \in K[x]$ *such that*

$$\nu_i(h) < \nu'(h) \quad \textit{for all } i \textit{ of the form } i = \ell + t, t \in \mathbb{N}_0. \tag{6.27}$$

Take such an h *which has the smallest degree. Then the integer* δ *is of the form* $\delta = p^e$ *for some* $e \in \mathbb{N}_0$ *(in particular,* $\delta = 1$ *whenever* char $k_\nu = 0$*).*

Proof. We give a proof by contradiction. Write

$$\delta = p^e v, \qquad \text{where if char } k_\nu = p > 0 \text{ then } p \not| \, v. \tag{6.28}$$

Suppose that $v > 1$. By Proposition 6.1, the sequence $\{b_i\}$ is non-increasing with t and hence stabilizes for t sufficiently large. Let b_∞ denote the stable value of b_i. Write $b_\infty = p^{e_\infty}$. Let $b = p^{e+e_\infty}$ and let $g = \partial_b h$. By Proposition 5.2 (2), $\text{in}_i h$ has the form (5.5) for $i = \ell + t$, as t runs over $\mathbb{N}_0$. Hence h and b satisfy the hypotheses of Proposition 4.12. By Proposition 4.12 and (5.5), $g \not\equiv 0$ and, for t sufficiently large we have $\text{in}_i g = v \, \text{in}_{\nu'} \left(d_{\delta i} \partial_{b_i} Q_i\right)^{p^e} \left(\bar{Q}_i + \text{in}_{\nu'} z_i\right)^{\delta - p^e}$. In particular,

$$\nu'(g) > \nu' \left(\left(d_{\delta i} \partial_{b_i} Q_i\right)^{p^e} \right) + \delta \beta_{\ell+t} - p^e \beta_{\ell+t} = \nu' \left(\left(d_{\delta i} \partial_{b_i} Q_i\right)^{p^e} \right) + p^e (v-1) \beta_{\ell+t} = \nu_i(g)$$

(here is where we are using $v > 1$), which contradicts the fact that h has minimal degree among all the polynomials satisfying $\nu'(h) > \nu_i(h)$. □

Remark 6.6. Let the notation be as in Proposition 6.5. Assume, in addition, that the sequence $\{\beta_{\ell+t}\}$ is unbounded in Γ_1'. Then for any h satisfying (6.27) we have $\nu'(h) \notin \Gamma_1'$. Recall ((3.43)–(3.44)) that, by definition, $Q_{\ell+\omega}$ is the monic polynomial of smallest degree $\alpha_{\ell+\omega}$, satisfying (6.27). Let $e_{\ell+\omega}$ be the integer e of Proposition 6.5 and put $\tilde{\alpha}_{\ell+\omega} = \frac{\alpha_{\ell+\omega}}{p^{e_{\ell+\omega}}}$.

Assume that *char* k_ν = *char* K and

$$l = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_t = 1 \tag{6.29}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$. In particular, $b_t = 1$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$, $b_\infty = 1$ and $b = p^{e_\omega}$. Then we claim that for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$ the t-standard expansion of Q_ω has the form

$$Q_\omega = \sum_{j=0}^{\tilde{\alpha}_\omega} c_{jp^{e_\omega},t} Q_t^{jp^{e_\omega}} \tag{6.30}$$

and for any $b' < b$ we have

$$\partial_{b'} Q_\omega = 0. \tag{6.31}$$

Clearly (6.30) implies (6.31). We prove (6.30) by contradiction. Assume the contrary. Let e' denote the greatest non-negative integer such that $Q_\omega \in K\left[x^{p^{e'}}\right]$; by assumption, $e' < e_\omega$. Then $\deg_x \partial_{p^{e'}} Q_\omega < \deg_x Q_\omega$, so there exists $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that

$$\nu_{t_0} \left(\partial_{p^{e'}} Q_\omega \right) = \nu' \left(\partial_{p^{e'}} Q_\omega \right). \tag{6.32}$$

Take an integer $t > t_0$. Let $\sum_{p^{e'+1} \not| j} c_{jt} Q_t^j$ denote the sum of all those monomials appearing in the t-standard expansion of Q_ω whose exponent j is not divisible by $p^{e'+1}$. The operator $\partial_{p^{e'}}$ annihilates all the monomials whose exponents are divisible by $p^{e'+1}$. Thus

$$\partial_{p^{e'}} Q_\omega = \partial_{p^{e'}} \left(\sum_{p^{e'+1} \not| j} c_{jt} Q_t^j \right) = \sum_{p^{e'+1} \not| j} c_{jt} \binom{j}{p^{e'}} Q_t^{j-p^{e'}}. \tag{6.33}$$

Formulas (6.32) and (6.33) imply that the t-standard expansion of Q_ω contains a monomial of the form $c_{p^{e'},t} Q_t^{p^{e'}}$ and that for each j with $p^{e'+1} \not| \, j$ we have

$$\nu_{t_0} \left(c_{jt} Q_t^j \right) \geq \nu' \left(c_{p^{e'},t} Q_t^{p^{e'}} \right).$$

Then for each j with $p^{e'+1} \not| j$ and $j > p^{e'}$ we have $\nu_t\left(c_{jt}Q_t^j\right) > \nu_t\left(c_{p^{e'},t}Q_t^{p^{e'}}\right)$. Hence

$$\nu'\left(c_{jt}Q_t^j\right) > \nu'\left(c_{p^{e'},t}Q_t^{p^{e'}}\right) \text{ for all } j \text{ with } p^{e'+1} \not| j \text{ and } j > p^{e'}. \tag{6.34}$$

We obtain that for all t sufficiently large the t-standard expansion of Q_ω contains a monomial of the form $c_{p^{e'},t}Q_t^{p^{e'}}$ and all the other monomials not divisible by $Q_t^{p^{e'+1}}$ have values strictly greater than $\nu'\left(c_{p^{e'},t}Q_t^{p^{e'}}\right)$.

Then for all $t' > t$ we have $\nu\left(c_{p^{e'},t}\right) = \nu\left(c_{p^{e'},t'}\right)$. Choosing t' sufficiently large, we obtain $\nu'\left(c_{p^{e'},t'}Q_{t'}^{p^{e'}}\right) < \nu'\left(c_{\delta,t'}Q_{t'}^{\delta}\right)$, which contradicts the definition of δ. This completes the proof of (6.30) and (6.31).

Equation (6.31) implies that for all the monomials Q_t^a appearing in Q_ω with non-zero coefficients, we have $p^{e_\omega} \mid a$ (in fact, by a similar argument this statement can be proved not only for Q_ω, but for any h satisfying (6.27)).

Remark 6.7. Keep the assumption that $\{\beta_{\ell+t}\}$ is unbounded in Γ_1', as well as (6.29), but now assume that *char* $K = 0$ and *char* $k_\nu = p > 0$. By studying the coefficient of $Q_t^{\delta-1}$ in the t-standard expansion of Q_ω for different t, one can prove that $\delta = p^e = 1$.

Proposition 6.8. *Assume that the sequence $\{Q_i\}$ is infinite and that there exists $h \in K[x]$, satisfying (6.27). Take one such h, whether or not it has the smallest degree. Assume that $p^e = 1$ in the notation of (6.28) (in other words, either* char $k_\nu = 0$ *or* char $k_\nu = p > 0$ *and $p \not| \delta$). Then the sequences*

$$\nu_i(h) \tag{6.35}$$

and

$$\{\beta_i\}_{t\in\mathbb{N}} \tag{6.36}$$

are unbounded in Γ_1' (recall that we are assuming $rk\ \nu = 1$).

Proof. Proposition 5.2 (2) implies that $\nu_i(h) = \delta\beta_i + \nu'(d_{\delta i})$ and that $\nu'(d_{\delta i})$ is independent of i. Thus to show that the sequence (6.35) is unbounded in Γ_1' it is sufficient to show that (6.36) is unbounded in Γ_1'.

Moreover, to prove that (6.36) is unbounded, it is sufficient to show that the set $\nu'(T)$ itself is unbounded in Γ_1'.

To prove the unboundedness of $\nu'(T)$, let $\ell_1 = \ell + 1$. Let $d^*_{\delta\ell_1} \in K[x]$ denote the unique polynomial of degree strictly less than $\deg_x Q_\ell = \deg_x Q_{\ell_1}$ such that $d^*_{\delta\ell_1} d_{\delta\ell_1} - 1$ is divisible by Q_{ℓ_1} in $K[x]$. We have $\nu_{\ell_1}(d^*_{\delta\ell_1}) = \nu'(d^*_{\delta\ell_1})$ by Proposition 3.26 (2), hence $\nu_i(d^*_{\delta\ell_1}) = \nu'(d^*_{\delta\ell_1})$ for all $i \geq \ell_1$. Multiplying h by $d^*_{\delta\ell_1}$ does not affect δ. Thus multiplying h by $d^*_{\delta\ell_1}$ does not change the problem. Therefore we may assume that

$$\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} d_{\delta i} = \mathrm{in}_i d_{\delta i} = 1 \text{ for all } i \text{ of the form } \ell + t,\ t \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{6.37}$$

Clearly, the result of the Proposition does not depend on the choice of $z_{\ell+t}$ and $Q_{\ell+t}$ which was made in §3. We will now modify our choice of $z_{\ell+t}$ and $Q_{\ell+t}$ in such a way as to make the unboundedness $\nu'(T)$ obvious.

In view of (6.37), we have

$$\mathrm{in}_{\ell_1} h = \mathrm{in}_{\ell_1} (Q_{\ell_1} + z_{\ell_1})^\delta = \sum_{j=1}^{\delta} \mathrm{in}_\nu d_j \mathrm{in}_{\ell_1} Q_\ell^j. \tag{6.38}$$

Comparing the coefficients of $\mathrm{in}_\ell Q_\ell^{\delta-1}$ on the right and the left hand side of (6.38), we obtain

$$\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} z_{\ell_1} = \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} \frac{d_{\delta-1,\ell_1}}{\delta}; \tag{6.39}$$

In particular,

$$\nu'(Q_{\ell_1}) < \nu' \left(Q_{\ell_1} + \frac{d_{\delta-1,\ell_1}}{\delta} \right); \tag{6.40}$$

By (6.40), $Q_{\ell_1} + \frac{d_{\delta-1,\ell_1}}{\delta} \in T$. Replace z_{ℓ_1} by $\frac{d_{\delta-1,\ell_1}}{\delta}$, in other words, put

$$z_{\ell_1} := \frac{d_{\delta-1,\ell_1}}{\delta}.$$

and $Q_{\ell+2} = Q_{\ell_1} + \frac{d_{\delta-1,\ell_1}}{\delta}$. We now iterate the procedure. Precisely, assume that $z_{\ell+1}, \dots z_{\ell+t}$ and Q_i for $i \leq \ell + t + 1$ are already constructed. Put

$$z_{\ell+t+1} := \frac{d_{\delta-1,\ell+t}}{\delta}$$

and $Q_{\ell+t+2} = Q_{\ell+t+1} + z_{\ell+t+1}$. This completes the recursive construction. Notice that all the elements $z_{\ell+t}$ and $Q_{\ell+t}$ lie in a fixed noetherian ring A, namely, the $\mathbb{Z}\left[\frac{1}{\delta}\right]$-subalgebra of $K[x]$, generated by x and the finitely many coefficients of the polynomial Q_ℓ.

Lemma 6.9. *Let μ be a rank one valuation with value group Γ_1, centered in a local noetherian domain (R, M, k) (that is, non-negative on R and strictly positive on M). Let*

$$\Phi = \mu(R \setminus \{0\}) \subset \Gamma_1.$$

Then Φ contains no infinite bounded sequences.

Proof. An infinite ascending sequence $\alpha_1 < \alpha_2 < \dots$ in Φ, bounded above by an element $\beta \in \Phi$, would give rise to an infinite descending chain of ideals in $\frac{R}{I_\beta}$, where I_β denotes the μ-ideal of R of value β. Thus it is sufficient to prove that $\frac{R}{I_\beta}$ has finite length.

Let $\delta := \mu(M) \equiv \min(\Phi \setminus \{0\})$. Since μ is of rank one, there exists $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\beta \leq n\delta$. Then $M^n \subset I_\beta$, so that there is a surjective map $\frac{R}{M^n} \twoheadrightarrow \frac{R}{I_\beta}$. Thus $\frac{R}{I_\beta}$ has finite length, as desired. □

Coming back to the proof of the Proposition, let $H = \{a \in A \mid \nu'(a) \notin \Gamma_1'\}$ and $M = \{a \in A \mid \nu'(a) > 0\}$. Applying Lemma 6.9 to the local noetherian ring $\frac{A_M}{HA_M}$ and using the fact that the sequence β_i is strictly increasing with i, we obtain that $\{\beta_i\}$ is unbounded in Γ_1', as desired. □

7 Sequences of key polynomials with bounded values in fields of positive characteristic

In this section, we assume that char $k_\nu = p > 0$. Let ℓ be an ordinal number and assume that the key polynomials $\mathbf{Q}_\ell \cup \{Q_{\ell+t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ are already defined. Moreover, assume that we are in Case 2b of §3 (in other words, the sequence $\{\beta_{\ell+t}\}_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ has an upper bound $\bar\beta$ but no maximum in Γ_1'; this is the only case which remains to be treated to complete the definition of the Q_i). If for every $h \in K[x]$ there exists $t \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\nu_{\ell+t}(h) = \nu'(h)$; there is nothing more to do: the set $\mathbf{Q}_{\ell+\omega}$ is already defined and is complete. Assume that there exists $f \in K[x]$ such that

$$\nu_{\ell+t}(f) < \nu'(f) \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{N}. \tag{7.1}$$

By Proposition 5.2 and Corollary 5.8, there exists $t_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0$ such that

$$\alpha_{\ell+t} = 1 \ \text{ and } \ \delta_{\ell+t}(f) = \delta_{\ell+t_0}(f) \ \text{ for all } \ t \geq t_0. \tag{7.2}$$

Let $\delta(f)$ denote the stable value $\delta_{\ell+t}(f)$ for large t. Among such polynomials f, pick one which minimizes $\delta(f)$. By Proposition 6.5, $\delta(f)$ is of the form $\delta(f) = p^{e_0}$ for some $e_0 \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Moreover, we have $e_0 > 0$ for, by Proposition 6.8 $\delta = 1$ is incompatible with Case 2b.

Replacing ℓ by $\ell + s$ for a suitable positive integer s, we may assume that $\alpha_{\ell+t} = 1$ for all strictly positive t. In what follows, the index i will run over the set $\{\ell + t\}_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$. As usual, let $\delta = \delta(f)$.

Proposition 7.1. *There exist $i \in \{\ell + t\}_{t\in\mathbb{N}_0}$ and a weakly affine i-standard expansion $Q_{\ell+\omega}$, monic of degree p^{e_0} in Q_i, such that*

$$\bar\beta \leq \frac{1}{p^{e_0}}\nu\left(Q_{\ell+\omega}\right). \tag{7.3}$$

Of course, the inequality (7.3) is equivalent to saying that

$$\nu'\left(Q_{\ell+\omega}\right) > p^{e_0}\nu'\left(Q_\ell + z_\ell + \cdots + z_{\ell+t}\right) \tag{7.4}$$

for all $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

Proof. The idea is to gradually modify the polynomial f until we arrive at $g = Q_{\ell+\omega}$ satisfying the conclusion of the Proposition.

For i of the form $\ell + t$, $t \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$f = \sum_{j=0}^{n_i} a_{ji} Q_i^j \tag{7.5}$$

be the ℓ-standard expansion of f. Let a^* be an ℓ-standard expansion, not involving Q_ℓ, such that

$$a^* a_{\delta\ell} \equiv 1 \bmod Q_\ell. \tag{7.6}$$

Note that

$$\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} a_{\delta\ell} = \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} a_{\delta i} \quad \text{for all } i \geq \ell \tag{7.7}$$

by Proposition 5.2 (2).

Let $\tilde f = a^* f$. By Proposition 5.2 (2), for all $i \geq \ell$ we have

$$\mathrm{in}_i f = \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} a_{\delta i}(\bar Q_i + \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} z_i)^\delta,$$

hence in view of (7.6)–(7.7) we have $\mathrm{in}_i \tilde{f} = (\bar{Q}_i + \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} z_i)^\delta$. In particular,

$$\nu'(\tilde{f}) > \nu_i(\tilde{f}) \quad \text{for all } i. \tag{7.8}$$

Multiplying by a^* does not affect δ. Thus, replacing f by $\tilde{f}$, we may assume that $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} a_{\delta i} = 1$ for all i.

As noted in the previous section (6.4), since $\alpha_i = 1$ for all i, all the i-standard expansions of f have the same degree n_ℓ in Q_i.

Let

$$\theta(i) = \min\{\nu_i^+(h) - \nu_i(h), \beta_i - \beta_\ell\}; \tag{7.9}$$

we have $\theta(i) > 0$.

Lemma 7.2. *We have*

$$\nu_{l_2}^+(h) - \nu_{l_2}(h) \geq \nu_{l_1}^+(h) - \nu_{l_1}(h). \tag{7.10}$$

Proof. By Proposition 5.2, $\nu'(d_{\delta\ell_2}) = \nu'(d_{\delta\ell_1})$ and $\nu'(d_{\epsilon\ell_2}) = \nu'(d_{\epsilon\ell_1})$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned}\nu_{\ell_2}^+(h) - \nu_{\ell_2}(h) &= \nu'(d_{\epsilon\ell_2}) - \nu'(d_{\delta\ell_2}) + (\epsilon - \delta)\beta_{\ell_2} \geq \\ &\geq \nu'(d_{\epsilon\ell_1}) - \nu'(d_{\delta\ell_1}) + (\epsilon - \delta)\beta_{\ell_1} = \nu_{\ell_1}^+(h) - \nu_{\ell_1}(h),\end{aligned}$$

and the Lemma is proved. □

By Lemma 7.2 the quantity $\nu_i^+(f) - \nu_i(f)$ is increasing with i and hence so is $\theta_i(f)$. Taking into account the fact that $\bar{\beta} = \lim_{i\to\infty} \beta_i$, we have, for i sufficiently large,

$$\nu'(a_{i\delta}) + \delta\bar{\beta} - \nu_i(f) = \delta(\bar{\beta} - \beta_i) < \theta_i(f). \tag{7.11}$$

By choosing $\ell_1 > \ell$ sufficiently large, we may assume that (7.11) holds for $i \geq \ell_1$.

Next, write $a_{\delta i} = 1 + a_i^\dagger$ with $\nu'\left(a_i^\dagger\right) > 0$. Write

$$f = \bar{f} + \tilde{f},$$

where

$$\bar{f} = Q_{\ell_1}^\delta + \sum_{j=0}^{\delta-1} a_{j\ell_1} Q_{\ell_1}^j$$

and

$$\tilde{f} = a_{\ell_1}^\dagger Q_{\ell_1}^\delta + \sum_{j=\delta+1}^{n_\ell} a_{j\ell_1} Q_{\ell_1}^j.$$

(7.11) implies that for all j with $\delta < j \leq n_\ell$, and all i, we have

$$\nu_i\left(a_{j\ell_1} Q_{\ell_1}^j\right) \geq \nu_{\ell_1}\left(a_{j\ell_1} Q_{\ell_1}^j\right) \geq \nu_{\ell_1}^+(f) > \delta\bar{\beta} > \delta\beta_i = \nu_i(f).$$

Also from (7.11), we see that

$$\nu_i\left(a_{\ell_1}^\dagger Q_{\ell_1}^\delta\right) \geq \nu_{\ell_1}\left(a_{\ell_1}^\dagger Q_{\ell_1}^\delta\right) = \nu_{\ell_1}\left(a_{\ell_1}^\dagger\right) + \delta\beta_{\ell_1} > \delta\bar{\beta} > \nu_i(f).$$

Hence, for all i, $\nu'(\tilde{f}) \geq \nu_i(\tilde{f}) > \nu_i(\bar{f})$ which implies that $\nu_i(\bar{f}) = \nu_i\left(\bar{f}\right) < \nu'\left(\bar{f}\right)$; we have $\mathrm{in}_i f = \mathrm{in}_i \bar{f}$. Thus, replacing f by $\bar{f}$, we may assume that the polynomial f is monic of degree $\delta \deg_x Q_\ell$. None of the subsequent transformations

$$Q_i = Q_{\ell_1} + z_{\ell_1} + \cdots + z_{i-1}$$

affect the coefficient $a_{\delta\ell_1} = 1$, so $a_{\delta i} = 1$ for all i.

Choose $i_0 \geq \ell_1$ sufficiently large so that

$$\beta_{i_0} - \alpha_\ell \beta_{\ell-1} > 2p^{e_0}(\bar{\beta} - \beta_{i_0}). \tag{7.12}$$

Remark 7.3. Assume that there exist $i \geq i_0$ and j, $1 \leq j < p^{e_0}$, such that

$$\nu'(a_{ji}) + j\bar{\beta} \geq 2p^{e_0}\bar{\beta} - p^{e_0}\beta_i.$$

Then for any $i' \geq i$ we have

$$\nu_{i'}\left(a_{ji}Q_i^j\right) = \nu'\left(a_{ji}Q_i^j\right) > 2p^{e_0}\bar{\beta} - p^{e_0}\beta_i + j\beta_i - j\bar{\beta} > p^{e_0}\bar{\beta} > p^{e_0}\beta_{i'}.$$

Hence $\mathrm{in}_{i'}\left(f - a_{ji}Q_i^j\right) = \mathrm{in}_{i'} f$ and

$$\nu_{i'}\left(f - a_{ji}Q_i^j\right) < \nu'\left(f - a_{ji}Q_i^j\right).$$

Thus we are free to replace f by $f - a_{ji}Q_i^j$.

Definition 7.4. Take an $i \geq i_0$. Consider an i-standard expansion (7.5) of f and let $a_{ji}Q_j^i$ be a non-zero monomial appearing in this expansion. We say that $a_{ji}Q_j^i$ is **bad** if

$$\nu'(a_{ji}) + j\bar{\beta} < 2p^{e_0}\bar{\beta} - p^{e_0}\beta_i. \tag{7.13}$$

and at least one of the following three conditions holds:

(1)
$$\nu'(a_{ji}) < (p^{e_0} - j)\bar{\beta} \tag{7.14}$$

(2) j is not a power of p

(3)
$$\nu'(a_{ji}) > (p^{e_0} - j)\bar{\beta}. \tag{7.15}$$

In view of Remark 7.3, to say that the i-standard expansion (7.5) satisfies the conclusion of Proposition 7.1 is equivalent to saying that it contains no bad monomials, in which case there is nothing more to do. Assume that there exists at least one bad monomial. Let $j(i)$ denote the greatest $j \in \{1, ..., p^{e_0} - 1\}$ such that the monomial $a_{ji}Q_j^i$ is bad. Let $j^\bullet(i)$ denote the element $j \in \{1, ..., p^{e_0} - 1\}$ which minimizes the pair $(\nu'(a_{ji}) + j\beta_i, -j)$ in the lexicographical ordering among all the elements of $\{1, ..., p^{e_0} - 1\}$ such that the monomial $a_{ji}Q_j^i$ is bad.

Take $i \geq i_0$. To finish the proof of Proposition 7.1, we will first prove the following three Lemmas:

Lemma 7.5. *We have*

$$j(i+1) \leq j(i) \tag{7.16}$$

and

$$j^\bullet(i+1) \leq j^\bullet(i). \tag{7.17}$$

If $j \in \{j(i), j^\bullet(i)\}$ *then*

$$\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} a_{j,i+1} = \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} a_{ji}. \tag{7.18}$$

Lemma 7.6. *If* $j \in \{j(i), j^\bullet(i)\}$ *then (7.14) does not hold.*

Lemma 7.7. *If* $j = j(i)$ *then (7.15) holds.*

According to Lemmas 7.6 and 7.7, if $j = j(i)$ then (7.15) must hold. In that case, we will prove that increasing i, if necessary, and replacing f by $f - a_{ji}Q_j^i$ preserves the strict inequality (7.1) for all t and either eliminates the last bad monomial or strictly decreases $j(i)$.

At that point the proof of Proposition 7.1 will be finished by induction on $j(i)$.

Proof of Lemma 7.5. First, suppose $j = j(i)$. Since j is the greatest element of $\{1, ..., p^{e_0} - 1\}$ satisfying (7.13), and one of the conditions (1)–(3) of Definition 7.4, any $j' \in \{j+1, \ldots, p^{e_0} - 1\}$ satisfying (7.13) is a power of p and

$$\nu(a_{j'i}) = (p^{e_0} - j')\bar{\beta}. \tag{7.19}$$

We want to analyze the monomial $a_{j,i+1}Q_{i+1}^j$ in the $(i+1)$-standard expansion of f. To do that, write

$$f = \sum_{j'=0}^{\delta} a_{j'i}(Q_{i+1} - z_i)^{j'}. \tag{7.20}$$

Now, terms in (7.20) with $j' < j$ do not affect the statement of the Lemma. We claim that the same is true of the terms with $j' > j$. Indeed, take a

$$j' \in \{j+1, \ldots, \delta\}.$$

Write $j' = p^{e'}$. Then

$$a_{j'i}(Q_{i+1} - z_i)^{j'} = a_{j'i}Q_{i+1}^{p^{e'}} - a_{j'i}z_i^{p^{e'}}. \tag{7.21}$$

In general, the right hand side of (7.21) need not be an $(i+1)$-standard expansion, since $\deg_x a_{j'i}z_i^{p^{e'}}$ may be quite large, even as large or larger than $\deg_x Q_{i+1}^{p^{e'}}$. However, the $(i+1)$-standard expansion of $a_{j'i}(Q_{i+1} - z_i)^{p^{e'}}$ is obtained from it by iterating Euclidean division by Q_{i+1}. The first Euclidean division we perform consists of writing $a_{j'i}z_i^{p^{e'}} = Q_{i+1}g + h$ with $\deg_x h < \deg_x Q_{i+1}$. We have

$$\nu_{\ell-1}\left(a_{j'i}z_i^{p^{e'}}\right) = \nu'\left(a_{j'i}z_i^{p^{e'}}\right) = \nu_{i+1}\left(a_{j'i}z_i^{p^{e'}}\right),$$

$$\nu_{\ell-1}(h) = \nu'(h) = \nu_{i+1}(h)$$

and

$$\nu_{i+1}(Q_{i+1}g) - \nu_{\ell-1}(Q_{i+1}g) \geq \nu_{i+1}(Q_{i+1}) - \nu_{\ell-1}(Q_{i+1}) = \beta_{i+1} - \alpha_\ell\beta_{\ell-1}.$$

Hence $\nu_{i+1}(Q_{i+1}g) - (\beta_{i+1} - \alpha_\ell\beta_{\ell-1}) \geq \nu_{i+1}\left(a_{j'i}z_i^{p^{e'}}\right) = \nu_{i+1}(h) \geq p^{e_0}\beta_i$. This implies that all the new monomials appearing after all the subsequent Euclidean divisions have ν_{i+1}-value

greater than or equal to $p^{e_0}\beta_i + (\beta_{i+1} - \alpha_\ell\beta_{\ell-1})$, and hence, in view of (7.12)-(7.13), strictly greater than $\nu'(a_{ji}) + j\beta_{i+1}$. In particular, if such a new monomial is of the form dQ_{i+1}^j, with d and $(i+1)$-standard expansion not involving Q_{i+1}, we have $\nu'(d) > \nu'(a_{ji})$. This proves that the passage to an $(i+1)$-standard expansion does not affect $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}a_{ji}$, and (7.18) holds for $j = j(i)$.

The fact that all the new monomials arising from iterated Euclidean divisions of

$$a_{j'i}(Q_{i+1} - z_i)^{p^{e'}}, \qquad j' > j,$$

have ν_{i+1}-value greater than or equal to

$$p^{e_0}\beta_i + (\beta_{i+1} - \alpha_\ell\beta_{\ell-1}),$$

together with (7.12)–(7.13) also shows that after the passage to the $(i+1)$-standard expansion, no new bad monomials $a_{j',i+1}Q_{i+1}^{j'}$ are produced with $j' > j$ (the monomial $a_{j,i+1}Q_{i+1}^j$ may or may not be bad). This proves (7.16).

The proof of the Lemma in the case $j = j^\bullet(i)$ is very similar to that of $j = j(i)$, except for the following minor change. We can no longer assert that j' is a power of p. On the other hand, j' satisfies $\nu(a_{j'i}) + j'\beta_i > \nu_i(f)$, which allows us to use similar arguments as in the $j = j(i)$ case. This completes the proof of Lemma 7.5. □

Proof of Lemma 7.6. We give a proof by contradiction. Suppose that $j = j(i)$ and that (7.14) holds for this j. (7.14) can be rewritten as $\nu'(a_{ji}) + j\bar\beta < p^{e_0}\bar\beta$. Combining this with (7.18) we obtain that (7.14) holds with i replaced by $i+1$,

$$\nu'(a_{j,i+1}) + j\bar\beta < 2p^{e_0}\bar\beta - p^{e_0}\beta_{i+1}. \tag{7.22}$$

so the monomial $a_{j,i+1}Q_{i+1}^j$ is also bad and $j(i+1) = j(i)$. By induction on $i' \geq i$ we see that $j(i')$ is independent of i', so the i'-standard expansion of f contains a monomial $a_{ji'}Q_{i'}^j$ with

$$\nu'\left(a_{ji'}Q_{i'}^j\right) = \nu'(a_{ji'}) + j\beta_{i'} = \nu'(a_{ji}) + j\beta_{i'} < \nu'(a_{ji}) + j\bar\beta.$$

Then $p^{e_0}\beta_{i'} = \nu_{i'}(f) < \nu'(a_{ji}) + j\bar\beta < p^{e_0}\bar\beta$ for all i', hence the least upper bound of $\beta_{i'}$ is bounded above by $\frac{1}{p^{e_0}}\nu'(a_{ji}) + j\bar\beta$ and hence is strictly less than $\bar\beta$. This contradicts the definition of $\bar\beta$.

The proof in the case $j = j^\bullet(i)$ is similar to that with $j = j(i)$ and we omit it. □

Proof of Lemma 7.7. We argue by contradiction. Assume that $j = j(i)$ and that (7.15) does not hold. In view of Lemma 7.6 this implies that

$$\nu'(a_{ji}) + j\bar\beta = p^{e_0}\bar\beta. \tag{7.23}$$

Then, by definition of $j(i)$, j is not a p-power. Write $j = p^e u$, $u \geq 2$ and $p \not| u$, and

$$Q_{i+1} = Q_i + z_i.$$

Lemma 7.6, applied to $j^\bullet(i)$, implies that

$$\nu'(a_{j'i}) + j'\bar\beta \geq p^{e_0}\bar\beta \qquad \text{for all } j' \in \{1, \ldots, p^{e_0}\}. \tag{7.24}$$

Arguing as in the proof of Lemma 7.5, we can show that $j(i')$ remains unchanged as i' increases. Take $i' \geq i$ sufficiently large so that $\nu_{i'}\left(\partial_{p^e(u-1)}f\right) = \nu'\left(\partial_{p^e(u-1)}f\right)$. Arguing as in Remark 6.6 (specifically, in the proof of (6.30)), we show that the $(i'+1)$-standard expansion of f contains a monomial of the form $a_{p^e,i'+1}Q_{i'+1}^{p^e}$ with $\nu'(a_{p^e,i'+1}) + p^e\beta_{i'+1} < \nu'(a_{j,i'+1}) + j\beta_{i'+1}$. Then $\nu'(a_{p^e,i'+1}) + p^e\bar\beta < \nu'(a_{j,i'+1}) + j\bar\beta$, which contradicts (7.23) and (7.24).

This completes the proof of Lemma 7.7. □

Let $j = j(i)$. By Lemmas 7.6 and 7.7 the inequality (7.15) holds for j.

By Lemma 7.5 (7.18), $\mathrm{in}_{\nu'} a_{ji}$ cannot be affected by any subsequent coordinate changes of the form

$$Q_{i'} = Q_i + z_i + \cdots + z_{i'-1}.$$

Since $\bar{\beta} - \beta_{i'}$ can be made arbitrarily small as $t \to \infty$, by (7.15), taking i_1 sufficiently large, we can ensure that

$$\nu' \left(a_{ji} Q_{i_1}^j \right) > 2p^{e_0} \bar{\beta} - p^{e_0} \beta_{i_1}. \tag{7.25}$$

Take the smallest i_1 satisfying (7.25). By the minimality of i_1, Lemma 7.5 (7.18) and induction on i', $i \le i' \le i_1$, we see that the monomial $a_{ji'} Q_{i'}^j$ remains bad for $i \le i' < i_1$ and that

$$\nu' \left(a_{ji} \right) = \nu' \left(a_{ji_1} \right). \tag{7.26}$$

From (7.25)–(7.26) we obtain

$$\nu' \left(a_{ji_1} Q_{i_1}^j \right) > 2p^{e_0} \bar{\beta} - p^{e_0} \beta_{i_1}. \tag{7.27}$$

Replace f by $f - a_{ji_1} Q_{i_1}^j$; Remark 7.3 says that strict inequality (7.1) is satisfied with f replaced by $f - a_{i_1 j} Q_{i_1}^j$. This procedure strictly decreases the integer $j(i)$. Hence after finitely many repetitions of this procedure we obtain a polynomial f containing no bad monomials. The non-existence of bad monomials is preserved as we pass from i to $i+1$. Thus, by choosing i sufficiently large, we may assume that f contains no bad monomials; we will make this assumption from now on.

If $Q_{\ell+\omega} = f$ satisfies the conclusion of Proposition 7.1 there is nothing more to prove.

Otherwise, there exists $j \in \{1, \ldots, p^e - 1\}$ such that

$$\nu(a_{ji}) + j\bar{\beta} > 2p^{e_0} \bar{\beta} - p^{e_0} \beta_i. \tag{7.28}$$

Let $\mathcal{A}$ denote the set of all such j. Replace f by $f - \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}} a_{ji} Q_i^j$. Remark 7.3 says that strict inequality (7.1) is satisfied for this new f. In this way, we obtain a polynomial f such that $Q_{\ell+\omega} = f$ satisfies the conclusion of Proposition 7.1. This completes the proof of Proposition 7.1. □

Remark 7.8. By a reasoning similar to that of Lemma 7.5, the sets

$$\mathcal{S} := \left\{ \; j \in \{1, ..., p^{e_0}\} \;\middle|\; a_{ji} \neq 0 \text{ and } \nu(a_{ji}) = (p^{e_0} - j)\bar{\beta} \right\}$$

and $\{ \mathrm{in}_{\nu'} a_{ji} |\; j \in \mathcal{S}\}$ are independent of i for $i \ge i_0$.

Remark 7.9. We do not claim that the property that f is a weakly affine expansion in Q_i is preserved when we pass from i to some other ordinal $i' > i$. However, the above results show that for any $i' \ge i$ of the form $i' = \ell + t$, $t \in \mathbb{N}_0$, f is a sum of a weakly affine expansion in $Q_{i'}$ all of whose monomials $a_{ji'} Q_{i'}^j$ for $j > 0$ lie on the critical line $\nu'(a_{ji}) = (p^{e_0} - j)\bar{\beta}$ and another standard expansion of degree strictly less than p^{e_0} in Q_i, all of whose monomials have value greater than or equal to $2p^{e_0}\bar{\beta} - p^{e_0}\beta_{i'}$.

We define $Q_{\ell+\omega}$ to be a weakly affine standard expansion satisfying the conclusion of Proposition 7.1. By construction, this $Q_{\ell+\omega}$ minimizes the integer e_0 among all the polynomials f satisfying (7.1) (so that $\alpha_{\ell+\omega} = p^{e_0}$). This completes the definition of the Q_i.

Let $\theta_{\ell+\omega}(f) = \frac{\delta}{\alpha_{\ell+\omega}}$. It is easy to see, by the same argument as in Lemma 5.4, that the Newton polygon $\Delta_{\ell+\omega}(f)$ contains a vertex $(\nu'(a_{\theta_{\ell+\omega}(f)}), \theta_{\ell+\omega}(f))$, and that this vertex lies above the pivotal vertex $(\nu'(a_{\delta_{\ell+\omega}(f)}), \delta_{\ell+\omega}(f))$. The vertex $(\nu'(a_{\theta_{\ell+\omega}(f)}), \theta_{\ell+\omega}(f))$ will be called the **characteristic vertex** of $\Delta_{\ell+\omega}(f)$.

Remark 7.10. By construction, we have $\alpha_{\ell+\omega} = p^{e_0} \geq p$.

Proof that $\{Q_i\}$ is a complete set of key polynomials

Theorem 7.11. *The well ordered set $\mathbf{Q} := \{Q_i\}$ defined above is a complete set of key polynomials. In other words, for any element $\beta \in \Gamma'_+$ the R_ν-module $\mathbf{P'}_\beta \cap K[x]$ is generated as an additive group by all the monomials in the Q_i of value β or higher, multiplied by elements of K. In particular, we have*

$$\bigoplus_{\beta\in\Gamma'} \frac{\mathbf{P'}_\beta}{\mathbf{P'}_{\beta+}} = G_\nu[\mathrm{in}_{\nu'}\mathbf{Q}]^*.$$

Proof. Take an element $\beta \in \Gamma'$. To prove the Theorem, it is sufficient to show that for every $h \in K[x]$ such that $\nu'(h) = \beta$, h belongs to the additive group generated by all the monomials $c\mathbf{Q}^{\tilde{\gamma}}$ such that $\nu'\left(c\mathbf{Q}^{\tilde{\gamma}}\right) \geq \beta$.

We go through all the possible ways in which the construction of $\mathbf{Q}$ can end and prove the Theorem in each case. If Λ does not contain a maximal element then $\mathbf{Q}$ is complete by construction. Assume that Λ contains a maximal element λ. If $\beta_\lambda \in \Gamma'_1$ or if λ has an immediate predecessor, again $\mathbf{Q}$ is complete by definition. Suppose that λ is a limit ordinal and

$$\beta_\lambda \notin \Gamma'_1. \tag{7.29}$$

Then the 1-completeness of $\mathbf{Q}$ is given by Proposition 3.26 (1), applied with $i = \lambda$.

By definition, Q_λ is monic. Take any element $h \in K[x]$. Let $h = \sum_{j=0}^{s_\lambda} c_{j\lambda} Q_\lambda^j$ be the λ-standard expansion of h (here we are using the fact Q_λ is monic and so the λ-standard expansion is well defined). Let $\mu = \min\{j \in \{1, \ldots, s_\ell\} \mid c_{j\lambda} \neq 0\}$. By (7.29) we have

$$\nu_\lambda(h) = \nu_\lambda\left(c_{\mu\lambda}Q_\lambda^\mu\right) = \nu'\left(c_{\mu\lambda}Q_\lambda^\mu\right) = \nu'(h).$$

This proves that $\mathbf{Q}$ is a complete set of key polynomials. Theorem 7.11 is proved. □

Remark 7.12. Take an ordinal $\ell \in \Lambda$ such that $\ell+\omega \in \Lambda$ (in other words, such that the limit key polynomial $Q_{\ell+\omega}$ is defined). If char $k_\nu = 0$, we have $\nu'(Q_{\ell+\omega}) \notin \Gamma'_1$ by Proposition 6.8. Then $\ell + \omega = \omega$ and the construction of key polynomials is complete. If char $k_\nu = p > 0$, by Remark 7.10 we have $\alpha_{\ell+\omega} \geq p > 1$. Hence after at most ω iterations of this procedure we arrive at the situation when (7.29) holds and thus the resulting set of key polynomials is complete. This proves that, in any case, we have $\lambda \leq \omega \times \omega$.

References

[1] S. Abhyankar and T.T. Moh, *Newton–Puiseux expansion and generalized Tschirnhausen transformation I*, Reine Agew. Math. 260 (1973) 47–83

[2] S. Abhyankar and T.T. Moh, *Newton–Puiseux expansion and generalized Tschirnhausen transformation II*, Reine Agew. Math. 261 (1973) 29–54

[3] J. Herrera, M.A. Olalla, M. Spivakovsky, *Valuations in algebraic field extensions*, J. Algebra 312 (2007), no. 2, 1033–1074

[4] T.C. Kuo, *Generalized Newton–Puiseux theory and Hensel's lemma in* $\mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$, Canadian J. Math. 41 (1989) 1101–1116

[5] T.C. Kuo, *A simple algorithm for deciding primes in* $\mathbb{C}[[x, y]]$, Canadian J. Math. 47 (1995) 801–816

[6] S. MacLane, *A construction for prime ideals as absolute values of an algebraic field*, Duke Math. J. 2 (1936) 492–510

[7] S. MacLane, *A construction for absolute values in polynomial rings*, Transactions of the AMS 40 (1936) 363–395

[8] S. MacLane and O.F.G Schilling, *Zero-dimensional branches of rank one on algebraic varieties*, Ann. of Math.40 (1939) 507–520

[9] M. Vaquié, *Famille admissible de valuations et défaut d'une extension*, J. Algebra 311 (2007), no. 2, 859–876